DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 494 HE 010 356

AUTHOR Mayo, C. Douglas; Claxton, Charles S.
TITLE Conference Report: Improving College Teaching.
INSTITUTION Memphis State Univ., Tenn.
SPONS AGENCY Tennessee State Board of Regents, Nashville.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 73p.; Proceedings of a conference (Memphis, April 1978)
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Instructional Service and Research, Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee 38152

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Anthropology; Art Education; Biology Instruction; Chemistry Instruction; *College Faculty; *College Instruction; Community Colleges; Conference Reports; Core Curriculum; Economic Education; Effective Teaching; English Instruction; Experiential Learning; *Faculty Development; Geography Instruction; *Higher Education; History Instruction; *Instructional Improvement; *Instructional Innovation; Interdisciplinary Approach; Lecture; Mathematics Instruction; Music Education; Physics Instruction; Political Science; Psychology; Sociology; State Universities; Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

The conference report includes an explanation of the conference plan, a description of the highlights, and descriptions of each session. Among the session topics are: faculty development; instructional improvement in the community college, with emphasis on developmental education; conditions that enhance learning; improving the lecture; evaluating and improving instructional effectiveness; individualized mathematics, art, English, and science instruction; what research does and does not say about college teaching; common core and interdisciplinary instruction; experiential learning; learning styles; innovative techniques in the sciences, English, anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, history, mathematics, geography, art, music, psychology; and a tour of a comprehensive support center. The conference agenda and list of participants are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157494

REPORT

conference on

IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING

sponsored by

THE STATE UNIVERSITY
AND
COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
OF TENNESSEE

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

HE 010 356

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D Douglas Mayo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

1978

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONFERENCE REPORT

IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING

SPONSORED BY

The State University and Community
College System of Tennessee

CONDUCTED BY

Center for Instructional Service
and Research, MSU

Center for the Study of Higher Education,
MSU

Office of Public Service and
Continuing Education, MSU

REPORTED BY

G. Douglas Mayo

and

Charles S. Claxton

An Equal Opportunity University

Acknowledgements

Primary credit for the success of the conference is due to the 95 program participants. Their names, together with the sessions in which they participated, are shown in Appendix D. Special appreciation is expressed to the 8 people who attended the 23 sessions of the conference and prepared "highlights" of the sessions for the report. They were: Charles Claxton, Barbara Dorsett, Edward Ebbing, George Graham, Douglas Mayo, Mildred Mayo, Earl Potter, and Barbara Saunders. Linda Krute managed the business and administrative aspects of the conference and did so in an outstanding manner. Finally, the unwavering support provided by Wray Buchanan and Charles Fancher at the State Board of Regents was critical to the success of the conference.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements ii

Conference Plan 1

Conference Highlights 4

Opening Remarks 5

Symposium - Faculty Development: Some Major Issues 6

Invited Address: Why Worry about College Teaching 7

Instructional Improvement in the University 9

Instructional Improvement in the Community College: Emphasis on Developmental Education 11

Conditions that Enhance Learning and Retention 13

Improving Your Lecture 14

Evaluating and Improving Instructional Effectiveness 15

Individualized Instruction in Mathematics 17

What Research Says and Does Not Say about College Teaching 18

Common Core and Interdisciplinary Instruction 19

Individualized Instruction in Art, English, and Science 20

Experiential Learning 21

Invited Address: Learning Styles - Implications for College Teaching 22

Innovative Instruction in Biology, Chemistry, and Physics 23

Innovative Instruction in English 25

Innovative Instruction in Anthropology, Sociology, and Political Science 26

Innovative Instruction in Economics 27

Innovative Instruction in History 28

Innovative Instruction in Mathematics 29

Innovative Instruction in Geography 30

Innovative Instruction in Art and Music 31

Innovative Instruction in Psychology 33

Tour of a Comprehensive Support Center 34

Integrative Address: The Conference in Perspective 35

Assessment of the Conference 38

APPENDIX A - Planning Events and Dates for the Conference 40

APPENDIX B - Suggestions for Participants in Concurrent Sessions 43

APPENDIX C - List of Participants Attending the Conference 45

APPENDIX D - Conference Program 59

APPENDIX E - Assessment Form 68

REPORT ON

CONFERENCE ON IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING

In a sense, it was an experimental conference. We could not be sure that the model, commonly utilized in annual meetings of academic disciplines, would be a good one for a conference on improving college teaching. Would faculty members volunteer to participate on the program? Would they have something worthwhile to say, if they did? Would a wide variety of institutions and disciplines be represented? Finally, do enough faculty care whether or not college teaching is improved? We thought, although we were not at all certain, that the answer to all of the above questions was, "Yes." On the whole, this proved to be the case. This report provides further information on the topic.

Conference Plan

Early in the 1977-78 academic year, at least three organizations within the Tennessee higher education community were interested in conducting a state-wide conference on improving college teaching. As the three organizations moved toward implementing their interests, they became aware of the plans of the other two organizations. The three organizations were the State University and Community College System of Tennessee, the Center for Instructional Service and Research, and the Center for the Study of Higher Education — the latter two centers being at Memphis State University. These two centers coordinated their plans and contacted the appropriate official at the State University and Community College System of Tennessee headquarters, known as the State Board of Regents, to seek sponsorship of the proposed conference by that office. The inquiry included a description of the type conference that was envisioned and detailed planning notes concerning it. The proposal received a favorable response from the Academic Affairs office of the State Board of Regents. The main planning events are listed in Appendix A.

The plan suggested that the "core group" of participants be drawn from the faculties of the six universities and ten community colleges under the State Board of Regents. It would be a "grass roots" type of conference with emphasis upon practical issues; theoretical and administrative presentations would be held to a minimum. There would be a small number of invited prominent persons on the program. Thus, the model for the conference would be essentially that commonly employed at annual meetings of associations or societies of various academic disciplines. Inherent in the selection of this model was

the assumption that there is a great deal of talent in the area of teaching improvement within the State system and that it can be used to stimulate growth and instructional improvement. Also implicit in the plan is the recognition that a broader perspective from outside the State system would be beneficial.

In implementing this latter point, the conference was fortunate to gain the participation of Russell Edgerton, Executive Director of the American Association for Higher Education; Anthony Grasha, Director of Faculty Resources Center, University of Cincinnati; and Arthur Chickering, who was in his first year as Distinguished Professor of Higher Education and Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Memphis State University. The participation of Drs. Edgerton and Grasha was sponsored by a third organization on the Memphis State University campus, known as the PIRIT team. PIRIT is an acronym for Project on Institutional Renewal through Improvement of Teaching. The PIRIT team at Memphis State receives its primary leadership from University College. Other invited participants from outside the State University and Community College System included Dr. Earle Bowen, who directs the faculty development program for the University of Tennessee Center for the Health Sciences; Dr. Janet Pisaneschi from the Tennessee Higher Education Commission; and Mr. Frank Garner, a faculty member at Phillips County (Arkansas) Community College.

The procedure followed in inviting participation within the State University and Community College System started with identification of ten pertinent topics in the area of student learning and instructional improvement. In addition, twelve disciplines were identified in which there was a substantial body of knowledge concerning innovative instruction. These disciplines were the same as those included in the *Change* publications known as *Teaching Reports*, 1 through 4. Later, *Teaching Report 5*, including descriptions of innovative teaching practices in three more disciplines, was distributed by *Change* but was not received in time to include these disciplines. These two sets of topics were sent to the chief academic officer of each of the sixteen institutions in the system by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the State Board of Regents. The institutions were asked to distribute the list of topics to members of their faculty who might be interested in participating on the program of the conference. In each instance, the faculty member could indicate a preference for serving as the chairperson of the session, as the resource person, or as one of the contributors.

The topics were as follows:

a. *Instructional Improvement in Universities*
b. *Instructional Improvement in Community Colleges*
c. *Conditions that Enhance Learning and Retention*
d. *Improving your Lecture*
e. *Evaluating and Improving Instructional Effectiveness*
f. *Using Individualized Instruction in College Teaching*
g. *What Research Says and Does Not Say about College Teaching*
h. *Common Core Learning - A New Emphasis*
i. *Experiential Learning*
j. *Developmental Education*

k. *Innovations in Teaching Chemistry*
l. *Innovations in Teaching History*
m. *Innovations in Teaching Psychology*
n. *Innovations in Teaching Biology*
o. *Innovations in Teaching English*
p. *Innovations in Teaching Political Science*
q. *Innovations in Teaching Economics*
r. *Innovations in Teaching Mathematics*
s. *Innovations in Teaching Philosophy*
t. *Innovations in Teaching Geography*
u. *Innovations in Teaching Music*
v. *Innovations in Teaching Sociology*

By the deadline for indicating a desire to participate on the program, there were applications to participate in nearly all of the proposed sessions and from nearly all of the institutions in the system. Since the conference was to be held at Memphis State University and because of its larger size, initial participation by Memphis State faculty was restricted to two applicants from each of the five colleges with a view to filling in any blank places in the program with additional faculty members from this institution. This procedure worked very well, serving the joint function of avoiding a disproportionate number of participants from the host institution and at the same time filling the positions on the program for which no one had applied.

As it turned out, there were 95 people who participated on the program. The ones who were participating in the concurrent sessions as chairpersons, resources persons, or contributors were sent a set of suggested guidelines to be followed in conducting their session. These guidelines may be seen in Appendix B. All participants were encouraged to make notes or an outline of the main points they wished to cover; they were asked to talk from their notes, if they wished, but not to read them or read from a paper. Further, they were asked to conduct the sessions as a "discussion-interaction" type conference in which participants should talk for no more than a few minutes at a time without permitting other conferees to interact. Chairpersons were encouraged to make good use of the resource person and the contributors and to draw other conferees into the discussion. Toward the end of the sessions, they were asked to summarize the most important points that had been made and ask the group to supplement these points with any additional ones that seemed important to them.

The resource persons were described as college teachers having a somewhat broader background for the topic than most conferees would be expected to have. In addition, they were provided resource materials in the form of digests pertinent to their topic or reports on innovative teaching procedures currently being used in their disciplines. Resource persons were encouraged to share their knowledge of the topic both on a volunteer basis and on request, as consultants.

Contributors were described as college teachers who had had especially pertinent experience with the topic at hand. They were asked to describe this experience, to stimulate others to describe their experiences, and if possible to project constructive ideas beyond what is currently being done. In most instances, the chairperson, resource person, and contributors within a session coordinated their efforts prior to the meeting by exchanging notes, discussing the session on the telephone, or conferring in a face-to-face situation.

A little more than two months before the date of the conference, which was held on April 20-21, 1978, an announcement of the conference was distributed in numbers large enough for each faculty member in the sixteen institutions in the State University and Community College System of Tennessee to have a copy. In addition, multiple copies were sent to the five campuses in the University of Tennessee system and to some 30 higher education institutions in the vicinity of Memphis. This latter distribution included both public and private colleges and extended to some institutions in Mississippi, Arkansas, and Kentucky. The announcement included a condensed conference schedule, a list of invited speakers, information concerning the cost of registration (a nominal $15) and other information concerning local arrangement. In suggesting who should attend the announcement invited, especially, college teachers who: a) were interested in effective innovations and improved student learning and b) wanted to share their ideas and experiences with fellow conference participants.

The conference was planned for an optimum number of 150 participants, which it was believed would provide a wide range of views and experiences and would permit small enough groups in the concurrent sessions to have effective discussion and interaction among conferees. It was felt that the number of conferees could be increased to approximately 200, if necessary, without doing violence to the basic conference concept, since many of the conferees from Memphis State University would not attend all of the sessions. However, as the deadline for registration approached, it became clear that the total number of conferees would exceed the 200 mark, and the decision was made to restrict registration at 250 conferees. This was necessary in order to prevent a decline in the quality of the conference and because the meeting rooms for the concurrent sessions were approaching maximum capacity. As it turned out, a relatively small number of applicants had to be denied registration, and all of these had applied after the registration deadline. Appendix C contains a list of the participants.

Highlights of the Conference

Most of the conference sessions were designed for brief informal presentations and spontaneous interaction among conferees. While this approach has much to recommend it, it does not lend itself well to publication of the proceedings. In addition to the difficulties involved in transcribing verbatim recordings of sessions, much that is said in informal discussion would not be widely read, if committed to print. Yet, it is desirable to preserve the more salient points that emerged in the various sessions. One of the more effective procedures that has been used to accomplish this in conferences of this type is

to have an observer present at each session who takes notes and, immediately following the conference, prepares a summary of the main points that were brought out. This is the procedure that was followed at the present conference. Eight people, whose names are listed in the Acknowledgements section, served as the observers. Their observations in the sessions were supplemented, wherever possible, by notes and outlines that participants used in planning their presentations. A copy of all such notes and outlines were requested for this purpose, but in a number of instances they were not received.

In all, the observers described what they thought to be the highlights of the 23 sessions of the conference. It is necessary to emphasize that the section pertaining to each session is based almost exclusively on the perceptions of the observer. The participants in the session have not reviewed the section and are not responsible for it. The order in which the sessions appear follows the same sequence as that of the program for the conference, shown in Appendix D.

Opening Remarks

Billy M. Jones, President, Memphis State University

W. Wray Buchanan, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, State University and Community College System of Tennessee

President Jones officially opened the conference with remarks regarding the importance of the topic and the commitment of the faculty at Memphis State to improving college teaching. He expressed his sincere hope for the success of the conference and his confidence that it would be achieved. President Jones then introduced Dr. W. Wray Buchanan, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, State Board of Regents.

Dr. Buchanan spoke of the origins of the initial idea for a conference such as this. He pointed out the efforts of Dr. Charles B. Fancher in discovering the need for the Board of Regents to arrive at a specific policy on the subject of faculty development. Dr. Fancher's research in this area began in 1975, and this conference represents one of the end results of Dr. Fancher's efforts. Dr. Buchanan pointed out that another conference within the program of the State Board of Regents will be held at Cleveland State Community College in May of this year.

He said that the State Board of Regents plans in the near future, to review the efforts of each individual college or university in the system. This will be in two ways. First, a calendar-of-events is being developed which will enable each of the colleges and universities in the system to keep abreast of the actions of the others. Greater interaction between schools will result in allowing more exchange of information and ideas. Secondly, the Board of Regents is beginning a program to determine the actual dollar commitment by institutions to improve college instruction. This will allow

the Board to monitor the progress of new programs, enabling it to give proper funding to those programs which show signs of greatest promise.

Symposium - Faculty Development: Some Major Issues

MODERATOR: *Richard R. Ranta, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs - Academic Programs, Memphis State University*

PARTICIPANTS: *T. Earle Bowen, Jr., Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Tennessee Center for the Health Sciences*

Frank Charton, Head, Department of Energy and Resource Management, Roane State Community College

Charles B. Fancher, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, State University and Community College System of Tennessee

Janet Pisaneschi, Assistant Director for Academic Affairs, Tennessee Higher Education Commission

The participants in the symposium represented a wide range of views concerning issues in faculty development. This was not surprising since their day to day work ranges from teaching in a community college, to serving as a director of faculty development, to university administration, to serving as a staff member for the State Board of Regents, to representing the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. Following introductory remarks by the chairperson, the first panel member, Earle Bowen, emphasized several aspects of faculty development in light of a scarcity of resources. He related problems concerning turnover rates in faculty positions and conflicting role expectations. Bowen said most faculty are not prepared for new positions. He also posed several questions pertaining to "Why faculty development?" and "Who should be involved in faculty development?." He went on to provide the answers to his questions by examples and summarized that faculty development is intended for faculty to improve one's ability to carry out one's mission.

In his presentation Frank Charton used a topical approach to emphasize several points concerning teaching non-traditional students in a open-door-policy institution. He stated that commitment to educational goals plus flexibility in scheduling and entrance requirements are important factors. Charton said that the major challenge in these programs is to prepare faculty to deal with the non-traditional students, and the main thrust is that there should be accessability for persons of any age and educational level to pursue their educational goals.

The third panel member, Charles Fancher, discussed the factors that have led to the need for more faculty development programs. He said that student diversity and increased requests for more programs have had an impact on faculty development. The major issues he brought out were: to move beyond traditional methods, identify faculty development needs, achieve institutional objectives through faculty development, and deliver faculty development services where they are most needed.

While expressing approval of traditional faculty development practices, such as attendance at professional meetings, Dr. Fancher noted that better dissemination of information acquired at such meetings to other faculty members at the institution is needed. He made it clear that his office views funds utilized for faculty travel as an investment in improved faculty performance. The State Board of Regents must always ask itself, "What will the System gain?"

In addressing the issue of who should provide the leadership for faculty development, Dr. Fancher said that both the State Board of Regents and the 16 institutions in the System share that responsibility. The Board has moved ahead in systematic collection of information concerning faculty development efforts throughout the System and this year is requiring a statement in the budget submission of each institution concerning resources allocated to faculty development. In discussing the issue of delivery of faculty development services, Dr. Fancher noted the need for development of expertise in this area on the campuses of the member institutions of the System. In this connection he suggested the possibility that some of the institutions with more fully developed programs might be able to assist institutions whose programs are in an early state of development.

In a more philosophical vein, the "clean up batter," as she called herself, Janet Pisaneschi stated that faculty development was a responsibility of individual institutions. Her concentration was pointed at the concept of development of professionals and in this vein added several distinct descriptors of the characteristics a professional should possess, such as overall general knowledge, concomitant arts or skills, and orientation to community interests. All these aspects are concerned with the development of professional ethics. She summed up by stating that we may be affronted by apathetic students and bureaucratic hassles, but these must be overcome with the spirit to prevail and improve, and one way to do this is through faculty development.

Invited Address: Why Worry about College Teaching

Arthur W. Chickering, Distinguished Professor of Higher Education, Memphis State University

CHAIRPERSON: *Robert L. Saunders, Dean, College of Education, Memphis State University*

In introducing Dr. Chickering, Dean Saunders cited an unusually impressive

array of achievements and honors. Dr. Chickering began by noting the inconsistency between what we know about activities that result in effective learning and the essentially oral presentation he was about to make. The oral component was supplemented, however, by a large number of overhead projector transparencies which were helpful in assimilating the detailed verbal and numerical information that was presented.

In a direct answer to the question raised in the title of his address, Dr. Chickering said that there are five reasons why we should worry about improving college teaching. First, teaching is not as good as it could be, or as good as it should be. Recent studies have shown that the main activity teachers engage in is dispensing information, and the main activity students engage in is memorization. This type of exchange is neither motivating nor efficient. Secondly, good teaching has a practical payoff. He cited increased competition from outside organizations to attract potential students away from the conventional higher education institutions. In-service training by business and industry, as well as increased competition from the armed forces, serves to decrease enrollment. Consequently, good teaching has a "survival value" for the teacher. Job security is increased when one can turn out a better product — a more effective graduate.

A third reason, Dr. Chickering pointed out, is that good teaching is more fun than poor teaching. It is more satisfying to teacher and students alike when college instruction is better and the consequences are visible. It is a compliment to the instructor's efforts. The fourth reason is that good teaching is becoming more and more difficult to achieve. The student of today is no longer the bright student just out of high school, with study habits already developed. Today's student may have been out of the classroom for ten or more years. Knowledge cannot just be dispensed; many of today's students must be taught how to learn, as well. It is easier to tell students what they need to know than it is to arrange conditions so that students will carry out activities that will result in the desired learning. This latter approach is more effective, however. Today we suffer from an "option overload." With an ever-increasing variety of instructional methods and resources available, it becomes a complex task indeed to match the student to the method, and to use the most appropriate resources.

Dr. Chickering's final reason for worry about college instruction was that good teaching, more and more, is being demanded. Students and parents alike are requiring better value for their dollars invested in education. The legislature, as well, is voicing its demands for accountability and improved efficiency for money invested.

Dr. Chickering concluded his remarks on college teaching by comparing methods of instruction with methods of transportation. The development of transportation from the horse and buggy to the spaceship in such a brief span of time is comparable to the changes education must undergo. The necessary tools are there; the concern is there. The tools must be used to meet that concern.

Instructional Improvement in the University

A. Instructional Projects

CHAIRPERSON: *Laurence E. Lackey, Memphis State University*

A1. Using Individualized Instruction in College Teaching

PARTICIPANTS: *Donald A. Dellow, Memphis State University*
E. Dean Butler, Memphis State University

This session included presentations concerning two instructional improvement projects. Overall discussion included techniques of team teaching and the view that emphasis in innovation should not be centered on technology but instead on people — that innovative instruction should become more personalized. Certain systems were discussed, such as PSI (Personalized System of Instruction), where students move at their own pace, combining courses to provide frequent testing, immediate feedback and tutoring.

Donald A. Dellow and E. Dean Butler reported that the methods they used were a blend of cognitive and affective. This was believed to be accomplished by trying to get at traditional cognitive course matter by using more efficient technological means. The presentations described the individualization of instruction through a team-teaching situation using the Personalized System of Instruction or Keller Plan, human relations training, and simulation of an educational bureaucracy. The combination of instructional activities provides a considerable measure of individualization of instruction while at the same time integrating a number of cognitive and affective objectives. Data analyses on student evaluations were provided in support of this system.

A2. A Writing Project at Memphis State University

PARTICIPANTS: *H. Ramsey Fowler, Memphis State University*
Harry C. Cotham, Memphis State University

In the second presentation a writing project at Memphis State was discussed. The PIRIT (Project on Institutional Renewal through Improvement of Teaching) was reported as the sponsor of the plan to improve student writing. The project was co-sponsored by the Department of English and by University College. The project included a series of three workshops conducted by four experienced teachers of writing from the Department of English. The workshops developed means that faculty could use in their courses to help students gain experience in writing and, where applicable, they showed how to get help on improving student writing abilities.

The first workshop consisted of making writing assignments and some tips

for teachers who do not have time to teach writing. The second workshop focused on evaluating a writing assignment. The final workshop was designed to help participants evaluate their own writing assignments.

The thrust of these workshops was that members of the Department of English can help other university faculty by showing them how to design and evaluate effective writing assignments and by helping them, in a hands-on kind of way, to read, to grade, and to comment upon writing done by students for their courses. There was general agreement that there must be cooperative effort among all departments of an institution, if acceptable writing on the part of students is to be achieved.

B. Instructional Programs and Evaluation

CHAIRPERSON: *Michele B. Thomas, Tennessee State University*

B1. The Doctor of Arts Program

PARTICIPANT: *Fred S. Rolater, Middle Tennessee State University*

This session was divided into two sections, the first of which was concerned with the Doctor of Art program. After introduction by the chairperson, Dr. Rolater explained why the Doctor of Arts degree is needed. People are dissatisfied with the standard Ph.D. degree because the Ph.D. is so general and has little practicality. The Doctor of Arts program is funded by the Carnegie Institute and is an interdisciplinary approach which is especially good for community college teachers.

Next, how its operates was discussed. The student in this program does 25 hours in the content area with the dissertation being 9 hours credit. Also required are a teaching minor of at least ten hours and a twelve hour education core. The participant showed a videotape with three short segments, each of which dealt with different subject matter. The first segment was concerning a history project that might be of general interest. The second segment showed a physical education demonstration where a student was working with children on a rhythm exercise using sticks constructed from rolled papers. The last segment was on an intern in western civilization being videotaped during a lecture. All three of the illustrations emphasized how practical the Doctor of Arts program is.

Then the floor was opened for questions and comments that any of the conferees might have. There was a comment that, although this degree is a fairly new idea, some of its graduates already hold positions as deans and administrators. The program has the advantage that a person can pursue the Doctor of Arts degree during the summers with internships being offered at this time. There were several references to people who have finished their Doctor of Arts degree and have accepted positions at various institutions in Tennessee. There are

only 23 institutions of higher education in the United State that offer the D.A. degree, Middle Tennessee State University being the only one in this region. Literature was distributed concerning this degree, including a list of the schools participating in this program.

B2. A Departmental System for Student Evaluation of Teaching

PARTICIPANTS: *Steven M. Ross, Memphis State University*
Ernest A. Rakow, Memphis State University

After Dr. Rolater's talk and discussion period, the chairperson introduced Drs. Steven M. Ross and Ernest A. Rakow from the Foundations of Education Department at Memphis State University. They discussed a departmental system for student evaluation of teaching. Two avenues were discussed as to alternatives in evaluation. These were the standard approach and the cafeteria approach. The two participants described a method that combined the two, this being department evaluation. One point stressed was that the teacher does not administer this evaluation because of obvious bias that would occur if the professor were present. A proctor is used who is usually a graduate assistant. The approach was discussed briefly before going on to the next area of interest.

Dr. Rakow explained five tables that were in the paper. This generated considerable discussion from the audience. Dr. Rakow gave further details concerning the procedure used. All questions on the evaluation survey are analyzed question-by-question and the ratings used to correct deficiencies and improve instruction. For example, if the ratings were low on a certain professor, that professor would look at how he was teaching and try to make improvement so he could better relate to his students. A question was raised as to how professors can get students actively involved in classes. Professors at one institution made computer quizzes which interested the students in a research and statistics class and also in educational psychology classes. It helps if the students can see how they can apply what they are learning in class to real life situations. One question asked at this point was if a course is required, whether the rating is different than if it is an elective. There was no evidence to support this contention in the project being described. Also questions were raised as to the confidentiality of the comments concerning the professors. Assurance was given that confidentiality was upheld.

Instructional Improvement in the Community College: Emphasis on Developmental Education

CHAIRPERSON: *Charles S. Claxton, Memphis State University*

PARTICIPANTS: *Margaret S. Butler, Motlow State Community College*
Van Compton, Chattanooga State Technical Community College
Bea Murray, Volunteer State Community College
Betty B. Nelson, Volunteer State Community College
Dorcas S. Saunders, Shelby State Community College
Willardean Wiley, Chattanooga State Technical Community College
Allen Witkowski, Chattanooga State Technical Community College

This session had seven persons from community colleges throughout Tennessee with extensive experience in developmental education programs to serve as resource persons. The process used in the session was for the seven resource persons to work for about fifteen minutes with small groups and to identify the three or four major concerns and questions the participants had about developmental programs. The groups then were brought back together where they shared with the full group the most important questions they had. The resource persons, serving as a panel, then commented on the concerns raised.

Philosophy The panel stated there is frequently a lack of understanding of and commitment to the concept of developmental programs. If people can accept the idea that many students come to college unprepared for "college level" work and that assisting those students is an appropriate and key role of the community college, then success of the program is much more likely to come about. Widespread acceptance of the program by the faculty was identified as an essential pre-condition for a successful program.

Identification and Place of Students There often is difficulty in knowing just how to identify the students who need developmental experiences. Some colleges use standardized tests (e.g., the ACT) as part of the admissions process, and students whose scores fall below a certain point are referred to the program. In institutions where such tests are not routinely administered, referrals from counselors and teachers become even more important.

Program Organization and Support In some institutions special courses are established as "developmental" offerings and students are encouraged to enroll. At other institutions the courses in which poorly prepared students enroll are "regular" college courses. The difference is that the courses are highly individualized and are taught in such a way that the persons with limited skills in the subject start at their own level and are thus working on pre-college level material.

A further question on program organization is related to whether an institution should organize a separate division of developmental studies or simply have developmental courses (usually English, Math and Reading) offered by the respective divisions in the subject areas. It appears that there is a mixture of organizational approaches to the questions, and it probably is not

possible to say that one is clearly superior to the other. More important is the question of whether there is adequate understanding, skill and resources available to do the job.

The role of counselors and tutors is an important one, and such people do work in the various programs across the state.

Teaching-Learning In most discussions of developmental programs there is much talk of the importance of individualized instruction in working with developmental students; in this group there was vigorous debate on this issue. One view is that developmental students are the ones who probably need structure and group support and that individualized instruction may in fact be the worst approach to use. Another view is that individualized instruction is not necessarily synonymous with absence of structure and students working alone. Rather, it can mean simply that materials and learning experiences are provided which are most consistent with the student's learning needs.

Follow-up The central question to raise about developmental programs is, "How successful are they?" A prior question, however, is "What is meant by success?" Is it success if the student's academic skills have improved? Or is it success only when the student reaches a pre-specified level and is able to perform effectively in subsequent college courses? There is no clear-cut answer to these questions, but they point up the need for careful follow-up of students and systematic evaluation of the impact of the program.

Conditions that Enhance Learning and Retention

CHAIRPERSON: *Carol Purtle, Memphis State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Harriet A. Peterson, Tennessee State University*

CONTRIBUTOR: *James Eison, Roane State Community College*

The chairperson created an informal atmosphere at the beginning of the session by asking that first names be used. She also said that anyone who asked a question or made a comment should state his name and the name of his institution. She referred to Dr. Chickering's talk and how it applied to the subject at hand. Then she introduced the participants and their topics.

Research that has been done in the area of learning and retention does not provide clear-cut evidence that any one method of teaching, size of class, or other factor necessarily helps students learn. Some examples were given of how one professor had used the rules in grammar in conjunction with the writing of a term paper in music. Too often students do not seem to be able to transfer what they have learned in one class to another class, as was true in this instance. Also, how students study at home was discussed, but research does not show one way to be more effective than another in this regard. There-

fore, the conclusion of these comments is that a certain teaching procedure is not guaranteed to produce the same effect in the case of all students.

A number of comments and questions were raised concerning how to motivate students. Some ideas on this were having more tests, videotaping, and using other media in the classroom. Also some comments were made on cramming and who does it; it was suggested that on multiple-choice tests there is more, and on practical applications there is less. Comments were made concerning student notes. It seems that, when listening to a tape recording, about one-third of the tape is in the notes. If a professor writes on the board, this is nearly always in the notes. Although humor adds spice to the class, this type of content usually is not in the student notes. An idea was suggested of mimeographing a sheet with notes typed on one-half of a page, leaving the other half of the page blank for the students to use.

The next topic discussed was competency-based programs. In this approach, the students know exactly what is expected and studies with definite goals in mind. There are no entrance requirements, only exit requirements. The program is set up by dividing the work into modules, each having seven elements: rationale, pretest, prerequisities, preassessment, instructional activities (learning alternatives), post-test, and remediation if necessary. This is a clinical approach basically in that a specified outcome is to be accomplished. This competency-based teaching may utilize a pass-fail grading system with no letter grade being assigned. The point was made that some professors will not give a passing grade until the equivalent of a grade level of "B" is attained. An "I" (incomplete) can be given, in which case the student will have to complete certain tasks but not repeat the whole course.

The subject area involved in the competency-based project was student teaching. At this point, an example of a module was given, and comments and questions stemmed from this. One such question served to bring out the information that the student teacher has several conferences with his university supervisor and cooperating teacher. Several conferees indicated that they were uncertain as to whether competency-based instruction would work in other subject areas as well as it does in education. Others felt that the procedure was applicable to most courses.

Improving Your Lecture

CHAIRPERSON: *Alonzo T. Stephens, Tennessee State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Louis E. Mullen, East Tennessee State University*

CONTRIBUTOR: *Powell D. McClellan, Middle Tennessee State University*

After preliminary remarks, differing views including the much maligned

traditional position were described as a basis from which one can build and improve his lecture performance. The lecture was described in the perspective of its integration into other teaching methods. Various aspects were touched upon, such as certain processes of "mixing" techniques where information is intermittently transmitted and then students are questioned for purposes of feedback. The breaker techniques were discussed and their application to students in different courses. The breaker technique involved giving illustrations, raising and lowering one's voice, telling pertinent stories, and utilizing humor. Similarly when lecturing, it was suggested that the lecturer pause after no more than 5-7 minutes. At these points, the students may be asked questions related to the material presented or discussion may occur.

The breaker procedure in essence forces the students to follow along with and, in a sense, participate in the lecture. It also has a stimulating effect which helps to keep the students alert and interested in the lecture. Naturally the attitude students have toward this technique varies widely. The highly motivated students seem to enjoy this procedure which they think of as more or less playing a game. They also seem to learn much more; even if they miss the question, they take more interest in the correct answer. The procedure seems to work very well with the adults in non-credit courses and also with adults in the regular college courses.

Evaluating and Improving Instructional Effectiveness

CHAIRPERSON: *Ralph E. Hillman, Middle Tennessee State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Burl E. Gilliland, Memphis State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Michael D. Everett, East Tennessee State University*
Janice Fry, Volunteer State Community College

After introducing the people on the program, the chairman stated that he would call on the two contributors for their initial positions on the topic being considered and that the resource person would be asked to respond to the points they made. The resource person was also invited to make original contributions, as were all members of the audience. As it turned out, there was quite a bit of interaction between the speakers and the other conferees throughout the session.

One of the points that was brought out was the effect that evaluating instruction has upon the level of the objectives that will be undertaken by an instructor; if the amount learned by the students is the basis for evaluating the performance of the instructor, he is likely to utilize objectives near the lower edge of the taxonomy of objectives, such as factual material and knowledge of specifics as opposed to higher level objectives, such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The reason for this is simply self preservation. It is much easier to demonstrate mastery of such lower level objectives, than when one aspires to achieve higher level objectives. Thus,

while evaluation often is seen as an essential step toward improving instruction, it can, under some circumstances, have the opposite effect.

A number of questions were raised during the session, some of which were not readily answerable. Among the questions raised were the following: What is instructional effectiveness? What is the institutions' responsibility for it? How is this institutional responsibility shared by the instructor? What are some of the outcomes or indicators of instructional effectiveness? Are we willing to make the results of evaluation studies public, if indeed, we are able to generate such information? To what extent is teaching an art which is essentially private and not susceptible to systematic study and analysis?

In considering the question of whether or not instructional effectiveness can be measured, the view was expressed that the answer is, "yes," if we are willing to settle for less than perfect measures. Evaluation must not be limited to measures of initial test performance alone; adequate evaluation must come to grips with the question of the extent to which lasting effects on behavior are achieved.

Another view expressed was to the effect that evaluation, however done, must be couched in terms of student growth. Toward the end of the session, the eleven recommendations of the Southern Regional Education Board Task Force on Faculty Evaluation and Institutional rewards were listed and discussed to the extent that time permitted. The Task Force recommended that:

a. The purposes of a faculty evaluation program be comprehensive, clearly articulated and publicly stated.

b. Faculty members and administrators be involved in determining comprehensive purposes and be committed to using the results of evaluation for meeting all purposes, including those that relate to faculty growth and instructional improvement.

c. Procedures to be employed in the program's operation be suitable to achieve the stated purposes.

d. Faculty members be involved in developing the program and continually in its operation and in ways that will stimulate and enhance strong and astute faculty leadership.

e. The evaluation of faculty be part of a larger system which also focuses on administrators, chairpersons, and other staff, and be designed to reflect local circumstances, both inside the institution and in its supporting environment.

f. The system be designed to include a feedback mechanism for regular review through which the system can evolve and improve with experience.

g. Appropriate flexibility be built into the evaluation system, with provisions for differentiated criteria to serve varying professional roles of faculty and for differentiated criteria to be used in judging varying approaches to instructions.

h. Activity areas, such as advising, public and institutional service, personal attributes, administrative involvement and others which are frequently considered in evaluation be explicitly identified if they are to be included as part of the system.

i. A system for evaluation include provisions for collecting data from many sources and recommendations from multiple participants, since decisions made even in the most carefully conceived systems of evaluation will still largely depend upon a collection of subjective judgments.

j. Evaluation systems place emphasis on improving ways of assessing student learning and growth as a means of determining instructional effectiveness.

k. Evaluation programs be designed and data collected which can be used to further faculty growth.

Individualized Instruction in Mathematics

CHAIRPERSON: *Martha Scarbrough, Motlow State Community College*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Gladys Crates, Chattanooga State Technical Community College*

CONTRIBUTOR: *Evalyn H. Frick, Shelby State Community College*

This session considered efforts being made to offer mathematics courses on some type of individualized basis. One contributor explained that the method her school used included a series of audio-tutorial tapes housed in a resource center. The tapes are used in conjunction with a text. Although there is no class period assigned, students are expected to attend the lab regularly. The lab is constantly staffed with at least one mathematics assistant during regularly school hours. They also rely on regular faculty members donating a part of their office hours to help maintain the lab.

Questions from the participants were concerned with attendance policies and grading. They were told that an attendance record is kept and about five hours per week attendance was considered necessary for completion of the course. Each course is broken into units; 80% mastery is required for each unit before the student can proceed to the next unit. A student is allowed to re-test on a unit, if necessary. An interesting feature of this method is the "E" grade. This grade is given to students who complete at least

one-half of the course at the 70% level. This allows the student to re-enroll at the beginning of the next semester, taking up where he left off. The contributor cited a problem in finding an appropriate text which could be used with this modular format.

The second method discussed involved a diagnostic test to identify students who might need the individualized program. Although placement in accordance with the results of the test is not required, students are urged to take the appropriate course. This institution has an "N" grade which allows a student who does not complete the course in the prescribed time to pick up at the point to which he had progressed, after re-enrolling for the next term.

Questions were raised concerning the use of computer assisted program. A comment was made about Dr. McHenry's CATS program which scores tests and keeps records in a variety of lower-level mathematics courses at Memphis State University. One advantage of this program is that all testing can be done at one location, at any time. This program however requires a good deal of preliminary work by the instructor.

What Research Says and Does Not Say about College Teaching

CHAIRPERSON: *G. Douglas Mayo, Memphis State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Merrill Parker, Chattanooga State Technical Community College*
H. Leon Prather, Tennessee State University

Discussed first were research studies in the area of learning. Four topics were mentioned: class size, teacher type, testing, and independent study. Strong evidence was found that daily quizzes are important in regard to the final grade, especially in social sciences. Less evidence is available to support this in mathematics and technical areas. Smaller classes seem to be preferred over large ones, but a feeling prevailed that class size and the type of course should be interrelated for effectiveness in teaching.

The lecture method of teaching seems to be a good choice when learning factual material, whereas discussion is to be preferred when problem-solving and attitudinal matters are involved. Grading procedures have an important effect on what and how much is learned. Students tend to learn what appears on the tests. They also learn more when they receive grades than when they do not. Research supporting these points was cited. Independent study does not seem to be inherently better; this depends upon the topic, the student, and the professor.

The next topic discussed was what research does <u>not</u> say about college teaching. The point was made that many professors are "trapped" to publish or

perish. We have not researched the numerous ramifications of this widespread policy. What are its effects upon student learning, successful completion of degrees, and student and faculty fulfilment? The publish or perish policy was said to be especially detrimental to black professors, since the number of publications by blacks is disproportionately low. An estimate was made that about 90 percent of books published are essentially worthless. There is so much duplicated in the remaining 10 percent that about one-half of it is not of much value. One reason for so much useless material is that professors are forced to write and do not have the interest or expertise required to produce good publications. The question was raised as to whether one should be discouraged from publishing just because publishing is so hard; the answer given was, "definitely not."

Returning to the topic of learning principles, it was noted that research conducted during the last decade has pointed up more exceptions to established principles of learning than was believed to be the case ten or fifteen years ago. Human behavior, including learning, is more complex than it was thought to be, and as a result principles have less generality. Extensive search of research literature on learning shows many instances in which significant differences were not found when isolated variables are studied; however, when larger, complex systems such as the personalized system of instruction, audio-tutorial procedures, and certain computer based systems are studied, they usually turn out to be more effective, more efficient, or both.

Common Core and Interdisciplinary Instruction: A New Emphasis

CHAIRPERSON: *John W. Welker, Austin Peay State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *J. P. Blumenfeld, Shelby State Community College*

CONTRIBUTOR: *Susanne B. Darnell, University College, Memphis State University*

Two programs of similar intent were described. They were the University College at Memphis State University and General College at Shelby State Community College. University College was viewed from the standpoint of a variety of goals and interdisciplinary designs. The main involvements were assessed to be in thematic studies courses. The curriculum draws from several departments in order to synthesize and build a program that focuses on a particular theme. Faculty inputs and improvisations are important to interdisciplinary instruction. The development of several upper level courses using the "team teaching" approach is an example of innovative faculty involvement.

It was brought out that the type of student enrolled plays an important part in determining curriculum offerings of both the Memphis State and

Shelby State programs. The majority are non-traditional students who tend to be slightly older and have a clear concept of their educational goals and learning required to achieve them. These students want courses that are pertinent and usable in their lives.

Several factors were discussed in relation to the maintenance and expansion of these programs, such as: (a) the process of faculty inputs for course proposals and activities, final approval to be handled by a faculty committee; (b) the development of ongoing processes for course development so that institutionalization may be accomplished; (c) a reward system needs to deliver adequate stimulus for faculty involvement and extra efforts; (d) support systems are needed to aid in faculty development of instructors in interdisciplinary teaching; and (e) identification of dominant ideas and themes that are not well suited to a regular curriculum.

Individualized Instruction in Art, English, and Science

CHAIRPERSON: *Yvonne Ralston, Memphis State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Nancy Sharpe, Memphis State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Dee Ann K. Browder, Chattanooga State Technical Community College*
Ray Burkett, Shelby State Community College

Each of the members of this group presented the methods used in their institutions in their particular disciplines. Many of the key ideas of the conference were re-stated here. One instructor stressed the need to identify the characteristics of individual students in the class. The process of cognitive mapping is being employed to match student needs with resources available to the instructor. It was stressed that some degree of experimentation was needed to find the appropriate program. It was found that some students in self-paced programs waited until the last moment and ended up not being able to meet the required standard. In order to combat this, the instructor created a reward system by which the student received bonus points when he took the quiz as soon as it was offered. On the other hand, points were subtracted if the student delayed. In order to recognize the individuality of the students, grading could be based on one of three types of work: examinations only, reports only, or a combination of the two.

One contributor noted several problems encountered in developmental English courses. Students, aware that they could retest, would take the test once "to study" then retake what they expected to be the same test, for a grade. This can, of course, be stopped by multiple forms of the same test. As suggested earlier, a reward system of bonus points for passing the test

early also works in this situation. This instructor also commented on the problem of a stigma being attached to students who enter developmental classes. At one institution, the regular faculty is used to manage the developmental classes; success in this situation depends heavily on the teacher's motivation to help student with special learning needs.

The final discussion considered individualized instruction in art. It was suggested that art courses, at least at the higher levels, cannot be considered in the same way as other courses. The instructor's intent is to develop the students' creative abilities. For an instructor to grade a student's work based on some pre-set criteria defeats the objective. The instructor's role is to polish the student's pre-developed concepts and ideas, not to change them. The usual procedure is for students to critique each others works. The instructor should encourage the type of participation in this which allows the student to recognize and develop his own feelings and ideas. Grading is usually based on effort and improvement.

A comment from the audience was that people in these classes were usually more motivated from the outset; they are there because they enjoy the course, not because they have to be there. There is no outside pressure because these courses normally are not required. A reply from the panel was to the effect that this is the type of atmosphere which should be in every classroom, self-motivation and satisfaction on the student's part. In order for this to occur, the student must feel that he is a part of the learning process; this is achieved, in part, by the strong group feeling which evolves.

Experiential Learning

CO-CONTRIBUTORS: *Norm Ervin, Shelby State Community College*
Frank Garner, Phillips County (Arkansas) Community College

Mr. Ervin and Mr. Garner explained that experiential learning are learning experiences which go beyond traditional classrooms, lectures, and textbooks. In experiential learning the student is more personally involved and the learning comes more from the experience itself rather than just learning about the experience. There are two kinds of experiential learning: that which is under the sponsorship of the institution, such as cooperative education, field experience, practica and international experiences; and awarding of credit for prior, college level learning which the student brings with him to the institution. Many aspects of sponsored experiential learning are not new in that most colleges have for years had field training and internships in some of their programs. The assessment of prior learning is not really new either, as most institutions make use of the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) and challenge exam. What may be new to some is the development and use of other means of assessment, such as portfolios, for assessing prior learning.

The presenters are responsible for heading up the sponsored experiential learning programs at their institutions. In these programs experiential learning is provided to students through field experiences, practica, and internships in such areas as business, fashion merchandising, social service agencies, and allied health (i.e., medical lab, dietetic and food service, emergency medical technology, physical therapy, and orthonics). The presenters stressed that the students in the programs are really involved in learning, not just in working. The internships and other experiences include learning objectives, on the job supervision, and evaluation by the field supervisor and the faculty member.

Mr. Ervin and Mr. Garner described their institutions' involvement in the Mid-South Cluster on Experiential Learning, a consortium made up of six area community colleges: Dyersburg State, Jackson State, and Shelby State (in west Tennessee), and East Arkansas, Mississippi County, and Phillips County (in east Arkansas). Memphis State University, through the Center for the Study of Higher Education, is the coordinating institution. The cluster is part of a national project being carried out by the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning (CAEL). The purpose of the project is to assist institutions in strengthening their programs in sponsored experiential learning and in the assessment of prior learning, including portfolio development, faculty preparation, finance, transcripting, and the transfer of credit.

Invited Address - Learning Styles: Implications for College Teaching

Anthony F. Grasha, Director, Faculty Resources Center, University of Cincinnati

CHAIRPERSON: *Jerry N. Boone, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Memphis State University*

The informal approach and quiet humor used by Dr. Grasha served notice early in the address that this would be both a "fun" session and an educational one. This summary, however, will hold much more closely to the latter.

Historical roots of learning styles research are found in the early, and rather extensive, literature on individual differences. Included in this work were personality test measures which led to such observations as the student with high anxiety benefits from a structured teaching program and introverts tend to perform better than do extroverts in the traditional classroom environment.

Cognitive learning styles were then discussed. Examples included "visual orientation," "auditory orientation," and use of inductive or deductive reasoning. Limitations in the measurement of cognitive learning styles were noted with the observation that accuracy of measurement is more or

less in the probable science fiction domain.

Social environment for learning was identified as the primary interest of the current session. Central to this concept is the teacher-student interaction. It was noted incidentally that "teaching as you were taught" may cause one to use teaching procedures that are not well suited to one's characteristics.

The speaker had the group form triads for the purpose of teaching each other the following materials:

a. Student Styles as Identified by Richard Mann and his colleagues;

b. Student Learning Styles as Identified by Tony Grasha and Sheryl Riechmann; and

c. Teacher Styles from *Teaching Tips: A Guide Book for the Beginning College Teacher* by Wilbert J. McKeachie.

Following the activity, the main point was summarized to the effect that students differ in learning styles and that teachers differ in teaching styles. One style is not necessarily so much better than another, but learning tends to be more effective if student and teacher styles are matched appropriately. An exception to this was noted in the fact that students sometimes achieve more when the teaching styles used are not the ones that are the most comfortable for them. Teaching styles can be modified but often are resistant to change. Variety in teaching styles may be used to stimulate interest and enhance student learning.

Innovative Instruction in Biology, Chemistry, and Physics

CHAIRPERSON: *B. I. Naddy, Columbia State Community College*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Phillip M. Mathis, Middle Tennessee State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Robert Marchini, Memphis State University*
Bob Sibert, Volunteer State Community College
Don Harrison, Jackson State Community College
James L. Grove, Jr., Jackson State Community College

The session started with the chairman raising the question, "Why innovate?" After some discussion the answer arrived at was "to meet student needs." Instructional innovations which do not meet this criterion should be examined very closely before resources are allocated to them. An example of a videotape in chemical analysis, proceeding step by step through the experiment, was demonstrated. Students view the tape in the Learning Media Center

before attending the corresponding laboratory. While the use of this procedure seems to meet a definite student need, it was pointed out that more rigorous evaluation of its effects than have been conducted to date are desirable.

Another innovation that has proven especially effective is a step by step solution to physics problems in the form of booklets supplemented by an audio taped commentary by the instructor. It was found that the rate of unsuccessful completions in the course decreased from 48 percent to 28 percent after the materials were developed and the program was implemented. In subsequent semesters, the reduction in drop rate remained about the same as in the initial semester it was implemented.

The Teaching Information Processing System (TIPS) has been found to be quite effective and popular with students in introductory physics. Nevertheless, TIPS has fallen into disuse in this course for the simple reason that it requires five to seven hours of work per week that is not required when traditional classroom procedures are used. The TIPS process is especially well suited to large classes since it provides each student with information weekly concerning how well he is achieving the objectives of the course and what he should do to improve his performance. It also provides the instructor with summary information concerning how well each of the objectives of the course is being achieved by the students as a whole and individually. The termination of an effective teaching procedure because of other demands of the instructor's time, which are seen by the instructor as being more closely related to the reward system of the institution, was a point that recurred throughout the conference in a number of sessions.

Independent work assignments in the use of 14 different library sources in biology were described. After initial orientation, one assignment involved finding appropriate articles from the various bibliographical documents for a topic assigned by the instructor. A second exercise was similar but involved a topic selected by the student. This innovation has proved to be quite effective and requires a minimum of instructor time and effort.

The use of the audio-tutorial innovation, developed some years ago in the biology department at Purdue University, was tried in one of the community colleges in the Tennessee System. It was noted that the audio-tutorial system has proven to be very effective and popular with most students in a substantial number of universities. The results in this instance, however, were somewhat mixed, suggesting that different types of students my not be equally well suited to a particular innovation. In this case the self discipline required to attend open laboratories systematically and to work independently was lacking in the case of many students. Hence, some of the sections of the course have returned to traditional laboratory procedures.

Certain emerging trends were mentioned toward the end of the session. These included the trend toward merging natural science with social science and other academic areas, into interdisciplinary courses. Also included was

increased emphasis on aid to the handicapped in the natural sciences and elsewhere, increased emphasis on systematic procedures such as personalized system of instruction, computer based instruction, and audio-tutorial methods. Strategies for effective remediation also are gaining increased prominence, as are certain student-centered instructional procedures including individual study, inquiry and discovery methods. Instruction in the natural sciences should take these trends into account.

Innovative Instruction in English

CHAIRPERSON: *John N. Furniss, Memphis State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Tyree Miller, Tennessee State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Lillie R. Miller, Shelby State Community College*
Gary J. Doby, Jackson State Community College
Rebecca Yancey, Jackson State Community College

The opening statements for this session stressed the need for innovative techniques especially in teaching composition, for it is in this area that incompetence on the part of students becomes particularly apparent. Present techniques were mentioned such as supplemental computer teaching, modular teaching and remedial programs. But the realities of skeleton staffs and curtailment of funds make it a necessity that more efficient techniques be developed.

Two of the contributors presented ideas on teaching basic writing skills. Both stressed the importance of making writing a comfortable, positive experience through students drawing upon impressions from their own background and surroundings. Notable within both presentations was the subordinate role of grammar in the initial stages of getting students to write. Grammar, spelling, organization, structure, and development were all problems attacked after the initial writing process. Therefore, the students were liberated from a possibly hindering burden at the outset.

One contributor presented the technique of freewriting, from which the instructor can determine how much the students already know about writing and can begin from there to work on the apparent problem areas. Exercises are done orally in groups. They are given paragraphs with juggled sentence order. On putting them in order, they have to justify each decision. Paragraphs are presented in all upper case letters an completely run together with no punctuation. The group transforms it into a conventional paragraph and discusses the importance of incorporating each convention. The integral role of spelling is instilled in the students by having them struggle through poems and passages written in dialect.

One contributor stressed student awareness of surroundings and ability to

make incisive observations. Various exercises could be performed to try to get students to use their senses, such as: going on a field trip, being led around blindfolded, comparing two similar concrete objects, concentrating on a person in a group without that person's knowledge. In each case the students list their impressions of their observations and ultimately work on modification, sentence combination, and finally paragraph development. The students are also introduced to passages by accepted writers which give illuminating descriptive accounts.

The third contributor presented a technique for teaching poetry analysis that required no extra money or preparation time and was adaptable to different sized classes and various teaching methods. The students were asked to draw images representing their impressions of a poem and then list in words or phrases the emotions which the poem evoked. Afterwards, as a group they were able to respond verbally to the poem. Through the drawn images the instructor can gain an insight as to what is going on in her students' minds when they are reading poetry.

During a question and answer session following the presentation, a number of other suggestions were made such as: the use of model writing so that students become used to various types of writing both creative and utilitarian, the use of videotaping so that the students can monitor their own speech habits, and the desegregation of classes by levels of ability or performance for purposes of peer models and peer tutoring.

Two journals were suggested as good source material for teaching techniques: *Research in the Teaching of English*, a quarterly publication, and *College Composition and Communication*, a monthly publication, both published by the National Council of Teachers of English.

Innovative Instruction in Anthropology, Sociology, and Political Science

CHAIRPERSON: *A. Robert Thoeny, Memphis State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Robert Paul Sessions, East Tennessee State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Lewis E. Moore, Jr., Columbia State Community College*
C. P. Boyd, Jackson State Community College

Innovation may bring freshness and interest in a class to a teacher as well as to a student. Fair assessment should be made to show benefits and costs of innovations used.

It was pointed out that the more we learn about effective teaching, the more complex it becomes. Love of an academic discipline and knowledge of it are not enough. Skill in presentation is very necessary.

Two basic responsibilities of a teacher are to present content and to enhance education. A report was given on a program for meaningful practical experiences in government and politics for community college students. The students volunteer ten hours per quarter to work in public service. Examples of some of the choices of the students have been in working for the sheriff's office, a judge, a conservationist, political party activities, parks, or for a particular candidate in a political campaign. At the end of the service, the students evaluate themselves and are evaluated by their supervisors. Part of the student's grade on the course is earned in this way.

Some of the results of this voluntary public service have been interest in historic preservation projects, deciding to become political science majors, and employment in this area.

Other innovative suggestions for personalizing conventional tools in teaching sociology are to have students construct and administer questionnaires to find out needed material, tape recording of local people, using news items in class, taking mini-tours to locations of interest, listening to contemporary music, and analyzing the lyrics for cues to attitudes and sociology of today.

Innovative Instruction in Economics

CHAIRPERSON: *Michael J. Gootzeit, Memphis State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Rod Thompson, Motlow State Community College*

CONTRIBUTOR: *W. F. Mackara, East Tennessee State University*

The initial topic considered in the session was the Teaching Information Processing System (TIPS). One of the advantages of TIPS is that students get immediate feedback which they would not otherwise receive in large-lecture type classes. One of the limitations is that some students do not look at their feedback sheets; another is that the professor has to learn to enter information into the computer. Most of the economics classes involved in TIPS are required by the College of Business, and oftentimes students are not really interested in taking the course or doing any more than they have to. A further limitation is that the students may not fill out the test sheets with such items as social security numbers and may make minor clerical errors.

A number of questions and comments were raised concerning TIPS. One question was whether or not the same questions are used from year to year; they are not. Presently, plans are underway to provide a test bank of questions in economics where all professors teaching the course will have access to them. This will alleviate some of the difficulties of having to make up new tests each year. Also the TIPS surveys give the students a very good

idea of how they are doing in the class. The Joint Council on Economics Education was mentioned several times during the discussion. A suggestion was made that the computer based test bank be put in the library and made accessible for student use.

Some other innovations mentioned in the field of economics were: videotaping and using transparencies, slides, closed-circuit television. Some examples were given as to ways to get students to deal with real life situations. Suggestions were made that each student bring in newspaper articles on economic problems. Two approaches to teaching were discussed: issues and tools. The tools approach deals more on means than ends, while the issues approach emphasizes ends. The two should be combined for maximum results. An example was given in which a professor begins with low-level cognitive learning and moves to more difficult higher level material. In this approach, one starts out with simple, structured homework and progresses until finally the student is considering unstructured, real world problems. Everyday situations were stressed because there was a consensus that students do not know how to relate what they have learned in the classroom to everyday decisions. Specifically, the suggestion was made to take comics and sports articles and let the students identify and solve economic problems in them. This was likened to building a house. One starts out simply by building a dog house, then progresses to building a house for people, and finally ends up designing a house himself. The session flowed very well with much interaction among the program participants and the other conferees.

Innovative Instruction in History

CHAIRPERSON: *Richard E. Herrmann, Volunteer State Community College*

RESOURCE PERSON: *James E. Haney, Tennessee State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Ronald A. Messier, Middle Tennessee State University*
R. Morris Day, East Tennessee State University
Robert M. Rugg, Volunteer State Community College

Innovation is doing what <u>you</u> do effectively! Just doing something differently is not necessarily innovation.

In order to present American history in an innovative way, the speaker described his presentation of three American history survey courses. He offers a topical approach to the study of United State history as opposed to the traditional chronological method. Working within this framework, he emphasizes multiple interpretations of historical events.

The following is a sample of the manner in which multi-interpretation is utilized.

The origins of the Cold War would be interpreted:

a. by the nationalist interpretation which is characterized by idealism, American response to Soviet aggression, monolithic Communism and containment;

b. by the realist critique based on the concepts of national interests, balance of power, spheres of influence; and

c. by the radical interpretation which conceptualizes the "open door imperialism" and economic expansion.

After all have been presented, the student analyzes and compares the three interpretations and arrives at his/her own conclusions.

A project within an honors section of a course in western civilization was described. The students selected a character from a prepared list of historical characters, including such figures as William the Conqueror, Sir Walter Raleigh, Julius Caesar, and Joan of Arc. They did research on chosen characters, studied in groups, were questioned by other students, and were finally filmed on two interview shows in the format of the Tonight Show. From this developed issues and interaction of characters. The students learned far more than was originally expected. Although, this worked particularly well in an honors group, it is likely that this format could be used with other groups, if class size were limited.

Concern was expressed that there is need for change in both the theory and practice of teaching undergraduate history to meet the educational and cultural conditions at the late twentieth century.

Innovative Instruction in Mathematics

CHAIRPERSON: *James C. Pleasant, East Tennessee State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Juanita Woods, Chattanooga State Technical Community College*

CONTRIBUTOR: *Karen A. Bowyer, Shelby State Community College*

This proved to be a very interesting and productive session which focused on a mastery learning program that has been under development for approximately three years. More than 4500 students have participated in the program which involves six mathematics courses: beginning algebra, intermediate algebra, college algebra, business mathematics, concepts of mathematics I, and mathematics for the health sciences.

Several practical questions were raised which included, "What happens to

Veterans Administration payments to students who are "on the GI bill" when they take more than one quarter to complete a course?" The answer was that, if they can complete the course within a short additional period of time, they can be given an incomplete; but if they have to have most of another quarter, or in some instances up to five quarters, the students must pay for the instruction himself. It was pointed out that it is necessary to carry a full load to gain full V.A. benefits and that this often results in overloading students who learn slowly. There is a tendency for students to ask to take the tests on the units of the course before they have mastered the material; this has resulted in a requirement for completed homework before taking the unit tests. In addition, students are strongly encouraged to stay current with their work.

A member of the audience described a computer based mathematics course at his institution, which has proven to be quite successful. Discussion at this point turned to microprocessors, which were viewed as having potential for a substantial contribution to individualized instruction. Other trends for the future were viewed as extensive use of videotapes and integration of mathematics with other disciplines in an open classroom environment, involving team teaching. It was also noted that a good many students, not enrolled in mathematics courses, but taking courses that involve the application of mathematics, come back to the mathematics department for assistance. This was viewed as highly constructive from the standpoint of student learning. Fortunately, if can be handled without overloading the professional staff, since para-professional personnel are competent to assist with most of the problems encountered.

In answer to a final question concerning the overall success of the mastery learning program in mathematics and its cost relative to traditiona instructional procedures, the reply was given that more students complete the mathematics courses under the self-paced, mastery procedures but that it is quite a bit more expensive.

Innovative Instruction in Geography

CHAIRPERSON: *Ralph O. Fullerton, Middle Tennessee State University*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Lois C. McDougald, Tennessee State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Juanita Gaston, Tennessee State University*
Beverly Hardin, Jackson State Community College

An investigative project was described concerning residential patterns of black families. In the first phase of the project, sources such as early federal census records, early city directories, early maps, and tax records were consulted to determine housing patterns. These were recorded on maps for the years selected. Then the second phase of the field work involved

current residential patterns of black households. This information was obtained from current tax assessor's records, federal census records, city directories and similar documents and then was recorded on maps. These cartographical data were analyzed to try to answer questions about patterns and why they changed. It was stated that more information could have been presented if the teacher had used the lecture method to present the material but that by this investigative method the students learned to use historical sources and to seek information by field experience and then to analyze data from which to draw conclusions. They learned more efficiently by geography inquiry.

It was pointed out that there is a wide range of abilities in many classes. An effective system for honors students in an earth science course was described. This system benefits the honors students and those who need assistance. Grading in the course consists of points earned by answering daily questions on the previous session, laboratory assignments, objective tests, and modules or magazine articles. The honors students are used as laboratory assistants. They are asked to volunteer at the beginning of a course. Only those who have made an "A" on a previous earth science course and have exhibited interest and ability to convey information to others are selected. Laboratory materials developed by some of the lab assistants were exhibited at the session.

Innovative Instruction in Art and Music

CHAIRPERSON: *Bruce R. Smedley, Volunteer State Community College*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Douglas C. Lemmon, Memphis State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Orvil Moffitt, Motlow State Community College*
Charles Jansen, Middle Tennessee State University

Changes in curriculum were discussed; many of these changes have come about because of changes occurring in the community. Also, new courses and degrees are now being offered in the fine arts fields. For example, one school has a new Communications and Fine Arts College, which will lend itself to different types of courses. Also mentioned was University College, which integrates several types of courses (interdisciplinary in nature) into one course of study. Several new types of technological equipment are being utilized also. Some examples of these are electronic equipment in music (recording as well as creating music by this method) and electronics used in lighting in speech and theatre courses. Electronic music is being taught at one university in this region and in other centers around the country. Composing as well as performing is taught in this new music style.

Quite often funding is difficult to obtain. One possible solution is a simple form of computer assisted instruction (CAI) that a school can initiate

for a relatively small amount. One difficulty that was mentioned in connection with using a computer was that the faculty members should know something about programming. Most faculty members could take a programming course free of charge during the summer at their own institution.

Several suggestions were made as to how to integrate areas, such as art, history, analysis, and graphics. The point was emphasized that students do not see the interrelatedness of all their different subjects. So, it is the responsibility of the teacher to help the student see these relationships. This is somewhat easier at the community college level, because quite often the same teacher instructs in several areas. A question was raised as to whether or not skills are being taught. The response was that they should be, but they are not.

The next topic discussed was behavioral objectives. Often objectives are written poorly whether they are vague general objectives or specific behavioral objectives. It was suggested that a teacher should choose the level of specificity that best suits his own classroom needs. An example was given of larger behaviors being incorporated in certain fine arts courses in England. The achievement of the objectives spans a two or three year period. Students seem to be self-motivated and self-reliant in this individualized problem-solving approach. The wholistic behavioral objective approach was emphasized during the session, and it was pointed out how it relates to innovations in music and art. This type of objective helps the student apply what he has learned to life situations. An example was given where a student hangs an exhibit in art. He goes through the whole process from beginning to end. This was considered a very good approach in that the student gets experience in a real situation which he may encounter in life.

Mentioned briefly was how an art or music teacher can be creative. One may have noted that throughout this session the word "teacher" has been used. The point was made that an instructor or professor should be a <u>teacher</u> first and relate to the students' needs. Therefore, the teacher must know the skills necessary to teach creatively or innovatively. A question was raised as to "what a good teacher is." The conclusion was that he/she is one who skillfully utilizes a wide range of approaches and methods in his classroom and one who does not limit his own thinking. It was emphasized that college teachers could learn much from elementary school programs, such as Orff, where students get involved in many creative activities.

Innovative Instruction in Psychology

CHAIRPERSON: *Franklin Conley, Volunteer State Community College*

RESOURCE PERSON: *Michael Lupfer, Memphis State University*

CONTRIBUTORS: *Glenna Mingledorff, Volunteer State Community College*
Larry Adams, Volunteer State Community College
Anne Bright, Jackson State Community College

Near the beginning of this session, several excellent references concerning instruction in psychology were given and the publications circulated to the participants for examination. The references included *Directory of Teaching Innovations in Psychology* by James B. Maas and Douglas A. Kleiber, 1975, available from the American Psychological Association; *Teaching of Psychology*, a quarterly journal published by the American Psychological Association; *Report on Teaching: 1*, published by *Change*, 1976; and the SASP (Society for the Advancement of Social Psychology) Newsletter. Concern was expressed that many teachers in the area of psychology are not availing themselves of the information in these and similar publications.

The session moved quickly to means by which psychology can be made interesting and practical for students, particularly those whose exposure will be limited to one or two introductory courses in the discipline. It was mentioned in this connection that representatives of book companies can be helpful in suggesting publications that emphasize practical applications in psychology and that students quite often are very enthusiastic about doing projects of their own choosing which illustrate psychological principles. Instructors were encouraged to try new demonstrations of psychological matters; even if they do not work out as the textbook says they should, they stimulate student interest and the psychological principles involved tend to be remembered. Another way to increase the motivation of students is to challenge widely held, but basically erroneous concepts concerning human behavior. The initial response on the part of students often is to collect evidence to prove that the erroneous concept is in fact true, but ultimately they arrive at the correct conclusion.

At this point the trend of thought turned to means of implementing innovative instruction and the problems related to such implementation. The basic "commandment" here was said to be, "Thou shalt not cause problems for anyone - and for the administration in particular." For example individualized, self-paced courses often permit students to participate in a course at any time during the day; but if the course must be shown as scheduled for a specific time, often there will be students enrolled who are scheduled for other classes meeting at that time. This results in difficulty on the part of administrative officials in understanding how the student can be both places at the same time. The point also was made that labels are important, that "behavioral objectives" may

be a tabooed word, while a synonym such as "criterion referenced performance" may be perfectly acceptable. Another term that seems to be readily accepted, at least at the present time, is "alternative routes," suggesting that students with different backgrounds, learning styles, and aptitudes may reach instructional goals in different ways. While there are many applications of this, one which was demonstrated at the session was an audio cassette with multiple earphones which provides an alternative to class attendance, when necessary or desirable.

The session was conducted in an informal atmosphere with participants in the audience raising questions at any point they wished to do so. Members of the audience also contributed significantly to the session by commenting on the pros and the cons of the various points that were made and giving the other members of the session the benefit of their experiences.

Tour of a Comprehensive Instructional Support Center

A tour of the Memphis State University Center for Instructional Service and Research was scheduled concurrently with other sessions at two different times on the program. In both instances the other concurrent sessions were concerned with innovative instruction in specified disciplines, which gave conferees an opportunity to take the tour at the time when the discipline in which they were most interested was not being discussed. The tour was a self-paced one, modeled after the Boston walking tour. It included the three Divisions of the Center (Learning Media, Instructional Television, and Instructional Development and Support). Each division, in turn, had three to five points of interest; these points of interest or "stops" were manned by Center personnel who demonstrated activities performed and answered questions.

The total number of persons making the tour was 85. Overall, the comments from the participants were very favorable and positive. In the Media Division, the group was particularly interested in the individualized video services, involving both use within the Division and equipment and materials available for check-out to faculty. They expressed interest in the videotapes produced by the ITV Division and the use made by the Media Division of the tapes. Several questions arose: where does the financing and the budget of the Division originate; how was the Division begun; and what control is exercised over the Division. They were particularly interested in the fact that the Center was under the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and that the Center had a separate budget as opposed to being included in the budget of a department or other unit. Other questions: how many students and faculty use the Division; who can use the check-out materials; and questions concerning the day-to-day operation of the Division.

The activity at the "stops" in the Instructional Television Division was much the same. The participants were interested in personnel, budgets, and production aspects. For example, does a department pay to use the ITV facility; how are the tapes produced; who does the work? There were

a number of questions concerning copyright of materials, and the effects of the new copyright law on the work of the Division. Several questions were asked about capabilities for videotaping at remote locations, an increasing activity of the Instructional Television Division.

The Instructional Development and Support Division experienced much the same questions on budgets, costs, personnel, and supplies. Of particular interest were the "seed grants to facilitate learning," awarded to faculty with several expressing favorable views of this program. A polarmotion spinner was used at one stop and this stimulated discussion. Most were impressed that the facilities were made available at no cost or minimal cost to the faculty member's department. The computer terminal was a focal point. Numerous positive comments were made concerning its availability exclusively for instructional use. Very good reactions were expressed in the case of the Computer Assisted Testing Service (CATS) program. Several questions concerning faculty problems arising from computer use were asked. For example, what happens when faculty run into difficulties; do they have to sink or swim on their own? The answer was, "we can usually help them or find someone on the campus who can." The tour group liked the Experimental Classroom facility and the equipment made available there.

In summary, several points stand out: a) the group was positive and enthusiastic concerning the activities of the Center; b) were surprised that the Media Division did not provide delivery service for media and equipment; c) were particularly impressed with the number of students and faculty using the Center; and d) were astonished at the rate of development during the past three years.

Integrative Address: The Conference in Perspective

Russell Edgerton, Executive Director, American Association for Higher Education

CHAIRPERSON: *Charles B. Fancher, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, State Unviersity and Community College System of Tennessee*

Dr. Edgerton noted that an integrative address involving some 23 sessions and more than 90 contributors may well be an overly ambitious undertaking. He then proceeded to pull together the diverse threads of the conference, weave them into a meaningful pattern, and add some original contributions of his own. He had been supported throughout the conference by a small team of graduate students who had attended sessions, collected information, and performed other tasks, as requested. During the conference, Dr. Edgerton had dropped in and out of meetings and talked informally with numerous conference participants. Conferees were asked, "Why are you here?" One was "sent"; a few came because of interest in specific topics; but most came because of a general interest in the topic and because they wanted to exchange views with other people with similar interests. This indicates a grass roots interest in improving college teaching, which is a necessary ingredient if college teaching is, in fact, to be improved.

The motivation for change now is different from the forces that worked for change during the 1960's. Student unrest was the dominant factor at that time, whereas adult concerns in the form of political, economic, sociological, and especially demographic factors are the primary forces at work at the present time and may be expected to continue to exert influence in the foreseeable future. Speaking of demographic factors, much of what happened in the 1960's can be explained by the rapid increase in the proportion of the population in the age range of roughly 18-25. The drastic reversal in this trend, which is projected with certainty into the 1980's, has extremely important implications in many areas, including higher education. One example of this is the prospect of increased competition from the armed forces for the relatively limited population in the 18-25 age range. If anticipated military requirements hold, the armed forces will need one out of each four persons in this age range.

One of the new issues which has surfaced with much emphasis is "why college - who needs it?" The question is being asked in popular publications, by rank and file individuals, and by their elected representatives. There is intense competition for resources, both material and personnel. To see the matter in magnified perspective, one has only to look at the situation in Great Britain where, again, demographic factors will soon force large scale layoffs or retraining of personnel in higher education for work in other areas.

One senses that there is a feeling of alienation between faculty members and the administration of many institutions. The "trapped professor" mentioned in a number of sessions of the conference, is a case in point. There is increased questioning of administrators by college teachers and resort to the courts is becoming a common occurrence. A psychological depression on the part of college teachers is not an isolated phenomenon.

How do we go about improving instruction and solving other problems in higher education? We need to provide incentives. The nature of the reward system of an institution is certain to influence the emphasis that is placed on various activities by its faculty. Closely related to this is the matter of "role conflict" in which faculty find themselves. They are expected to be "triple threat performers" (instruction, research, and public service) and innovative, all within the finite time available to them. We need to find ways to resolve this conflict. We also need to increase our knowledge of how to improve instruction; this, of course, is the primary thrust of this conference. We need to collect more systematic information concerning the quality of our product — the performance of our graduate. Many institutions do not have a clear concept of what kind of graduate they are trying to produce. Sometimes we seem to be training students to be like we are, that is, academic scholars. But few of them will be functioning in an academic environment. When we write a recommendation for our graduates, we often comment on characteristics which we know are important but are ones which we make no explicit effort to teach. A final item, that we could do much better, is communicate our enthusiasm for the exciting things that we are doing well to our elective representatives. We tend to communicate with

them only at budget time and to emphasize the need for correction of negative factors. We should provide our representatives with positive information that they can convey to their constituents and to their legislative colleagues.

The session, and the conference, closed with comments and questions from the audience. One such comment was an expression of a need for continuation of the trend away from isolation of academic disciplines and toward better integration of the contributions of several disciplines through interdisciplinary, team teaching. In considering a question from the floor concerning what good teaching is, it was noted that a static answer to this question should not be given — that it must change as conditions change; many such conditions have been discussed during the conference. To this was added, with the reservation that it may be an oversimplification, that a primary goal of teaching should be to enable students to take over responsibility for their own continued learning. The conference was concluded on this constructive note.

Assessment of the Workshop by Participants

Near the end of the workshop, the participants were asked to evaluate the workshop, using a "branching type of assessment (a copy of the evaluation instrument is shown in Appendix E). The basic question asked was, "How worthwhile was the workshop?" Depending on the answer to this question, one of three sets of follow-up questions were answered by each respondent. Thus, if the answer to the basic question was that the workshop was very worthwhile, three more questions were asked which solicited an amplification of this initial answer. A similar procedure was followed if the answer to the basic question was that the workshop was "worthwhile" or that it was "not worthwhile."

Sixty-five persons completed the assessment form, and their ratings were as follows:

Rating	Number of Respondees	Percentage
Very Worthwhile	17	26%
Worthwhile	41	63%
Not Worthwhile	7	11%

Thus, we see that 89 percent (N=58) found the conference to be worthwhile or very worthwhile, and 11 percent (N=7) felt it was not worthwhile.

There were a number of comments on the three major aspects of the conference: plenary sessions, the concurrent small-group sessions, and the overall organization of the conference and the facilities in which it took place. The plenary sessions, consisting of a panel discussion on faculty development with Richard Ranta as chair, Art Chickering's presentation on "Why Worry about College Teaching?" and Tony Grasha's after-dinner session on student learning styles, received generally favorable evaluations. Typical comments were:

> "Dr. Chickering's session was very informative."
> "The panel discussion was useful in helping the participants get a clear picture of some of the key issues."
> "Tony Grasha's comments were very stimulating."

A few participants had negative comments, as well, including one person who felt these sessions were too long: "Those chairs got awfully hard," he groused. The most common complaint about the opening plenary sessions was that they seemed to some to be designed to show that faculty development and improving college teaching were important. Said one participant: "All of Thursday morning was spent on speeches to convince people who had come to improve teaching that they needed to improve teaching!"

A number of the concurrent sessions received frequent praise while others were criticized, but for the most part this seemed to be a function of the particular interests of the respondees.

Several people commented that the overall organization and planning of the conference was good, and they seemd to feel there was a minimum of "hassle" in registering for the conference, getting the conference materials, and finding the locations of the desired session. A number of people stated that the conference facility was very good: "Richardson Towers is an excellent meeting place, and the food was good too!"

There was a number of constructive criticisms and suggestions made, and some discussion of them is in order, particularly since we can all learn from criticism in order to strengthen subsequent conferences. The most common complaint was the feeling by some that there was not enough time to deal adequately with the topics. First, many respondees expressed the view that so many topics were raised that there was not enough time available to deal with them adequately. As one person said, "Just when we were getting into a topic or question, our time was up and we had to stop. Maybe you tried to do too much in the amount of time allotted." Others echoed this sentiment and suggested that there was a need for more concreteness in dealing with the issues and more "hands-on" work sessions.

This criticism is probably valid. In our planning of the conference, we made a decision to involve as many people as we could. This was based on the belief that extensive involvement of faculty members from throughout Tennessee would help highlight the fact that many good things are going on in "improving college teaching." A forum where these things could be talked about could have beneficial impact on people in the colleges and universities in the State system. We still think that was a sound rationale, but it does have the consequence of getting so many topics on the program that contributors were unable to go into adequate depth to reach a sufficient level of concreteness to satisfy some people.

The question of how much "hands-on" activity raises the issue of whether to have a workshop or a conference. When compared to a conference, we define a workshop as an activity limited to a smaller number of people and to fewer topics and greater opportunity for extensive participant involvement. Again, we chose a conference format, but in so doing we probably did preclude having enough time and a level of detail that some people would have liked. Perhaps an approach for subsequent activities of this sort would be to use a conference format but to build into it a number of special interest sessions which could be carried out in a workshop approach with adequate time and opportunity for extensive involvement for interested participants.

In summary, then, we gather that the conference achieved its objectives and that most participants were pleased with their involvement. Some constructive criticisms were made, and these can be helpful in similar activities in the future.

APPENDIX A

Planning Events and Dates for the Conference

Event No.	Event	Date
1	Letter seeking sponsorship by State University and Community College System of Tennessee (Dr. Charles B. Fancher, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs)	November 7, 1977
2	Coordination of views of the two M.S.U. Centers (CISR and CSHE)	November 9, 1977
3	Reserve Richardson Towers Conference facility for prospective dates - March 30-31 and April 20-21	November 17, 1977
4	Indication of interest on the part of State University and Community College System of Tennessee - by telephone. April 20-21 date selected	November 22, 1977
5	Mail draft of call for participation to Dr. Fancher	November 23, 1977
6	Letters go out to prominent invited speakers	November 29, 1977

7	Call for participation sent to chief academic officer of the six universities and ten community colleges for distribution to interested faculty, by State University and Community College System of Tennessee	December 9, 1977
8	Planning session with Conference Center personnel (Dr. Tom Collins, Ms. Linda Krute, and Ms. Lisa Scheinberg)	January 12, 1978
9	Deadline for receipt of indication of interest in active participation on the program from the six universities and ten community colleges	January 15, 1978 (Extended to January 20, 1978)
10	Announcement of conference completed except for program information	January 23, 1978
11	Content of program completed	February 1, 1978
12	Announcement of conference ready for printing	February 8, 1978

13	Reserve audio-visual equipment estimated to be needed	February 9, 1978
14	Inform prospective participants of selection or rejection - provide supplemental resource material as appropriate	February 15, 1978
15	Printing of Announcement completed	February 22, 1978
16	Mailing of Announcement completed	March 1, 1978
17	Pre-registration deadline	April 5, 1978
18	Conference Program completed	April 7, 1978
19	Hold Conference	April 20-21, 1978
20	Send letter of appreciation to those on the program	April 26, 1978
21	Confer with Conference Center personnel on business aspects of the conference and any "loose ends"	April 27, 1978
22	Conference report ready for printing	May 20, 1978
23	Conference report distributed	June 9, 1978

SUGGESTIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS IN CONCURRENT SESSIONS

All Participants

1. We encourage you to prepare for your session by making notes or an outline of the main points in your contribution to the session. Your making an extra copy for our conference staff to use in preparing the report on the conference will be appreciated.

2. Talk from your notes, if you wish, but do not read a paper. This is a "discussion-interaction" type of conference in which papers, however good, are not appropriate. Talk for only a few minutes at a time; let other conferees interact, and then talk briefly again.

3. Use visuals, if you wish; each meeting room will be equipped with an overhead projector and a 35mm slide projector. If other equipment is needed, let us know within the next two weeks. A technician will be on duty; someone in the Conference Center office will know where he is.

Chairpersons

1. Go to the meeting room a few minutes before the time for your session to be sure that everything is the way you want it. Most rooms will be arranged in a "discussion circle" configuration, unless you indicate otherwise.

2. Start and end the session on time. Introduce yourself, the Resource Person, and the Contributor(s).

3. Make any introductory remarks you wish and call on the Resource Person and Contributor(s) for relatively brief comments. Draw other conferees (all conferees, if possible) into the discussion.

4. Toward the end of the session summarize the most significant points that have been made; ask the group to supplement your list with any additional points that seemed important to them.

Resource Persons

1. In general, your background for the topic at hand is broader than that of most conferees. In addition most of you have been provided supplementary resource materials in the form of digests pertinent to your topic or reports on innovative teaching procedures currently being used in your discipline.

2. Your primary function will be to share your knowledge of the topic with the other conferees, both on a voluntary basis and, on request, as a consultant.

Contributors

1. Most contributors have had specific experience with the topic at hand.

2. Your primary function will be to describe your experience, to stimulate others to describe their experiences, and if possible to gain insights that go beyond what either of you currently is doing.

APPENDIX C

List of Participants Attending the Conference

Larry Adams
Volunteer State Community College

Julie Adkins
Manager of Instructional Development
UT Center for Health Sciences

William I. Amminger
Dept. of Mechanical Engineering
Memphis State University

Leslie Bailey
Center for Instructional Service and Research
Memphis State University

Harold R. Bancroft
Dept. of Biology
Memphis State University

Melvin C. Barber
Dept. of Geography
Memphis State University

Roger V. Bennett
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

Kathie Benton
College of Education
Memphis State University

Peter Berney
Dept. of Mathematics
Shelby State Community College

Jay P. Blumenfeld
Dept. of English
Shelby State Community College

W. David Boehmer
Volunteer State Community College

Wilfred Bohrman
Visiting Professor
Federal Republic of Germany

Jerry Boone
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Memphis State University

Earl W. Booth
Chattanooga State Technical Community College

T. Earle Bowen, Jr.
Asst. Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
UT Center for Health Sciences

Karen A. Bowyer
Dept. of Mathematics & Methodology
Shelby State Community College

Currie P. Boyd
Dept. of Sociology
Jackson State Community College

Nolen E. Bradley
Dean of Instruction
Volunteer State Community College

Franklin Brantley
Dept. of Foreign Languages
Memphis State University

Anne B. Bright
Dept. of Social Science & Education
Jackson State Community College

Dee Ann K. Browder
Coordinator of English
Chattanooga State Technical
Community College

Alma C. Brown
Coahoma Jr. College
Clarksdale, MS

Jim Brown
Dept. of Art
Roane State Community College
Harriman, TN

W. Wray Buchanan
Vice Chancellor for Academic
Affairs
State University & Community College
System of Tennessee

Paul S. Burgar
Education Evaluator
UT Center for Health Sciences

Ray D. Burkett
Dept. of Biology
Shelby State Community College

Ronald Burgess
Coordinator of Religious Affairs
Memphis State University

Wanda Burnett
Coahoma Jr. College
Clarksdale, MS

E. Dean Butler
Dept. of Foundations of Education
Memphis State University

Margaret S. Butler
Dept. of English
Motlow State Community College

C. Stephen Byrum
Coordinator for Humanities
Chattanooga State Technical
Community College

Tom Caplinger
Dept. of Mathematical Sciences
Memphis State University

Frank "Pete" Charton
Dept. of Energy & Resource Management
Roane State Community College

Don E. Chevalia
Division of Social Studies &
Education
Jackson State Community College

Arthur W. Chickering
Center for the Study of Higher
Education
Memphis State University

Joanne Chickering
Center for Student Development
Memphis State University

Jere Chumley
Cleveland State Community College

Charles Claxton
Center for the Study of Higher
Education
Memphis State University

Ron W. Cleminson
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

Boyne Coats
Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction
Memphis State University

Richard D. Coleman
Dept. of Conservation
Volunteer State Community College

Ronald R. Coleman
Coordinator of Extended Services
Volunteer State Community College

Thomas A. Collins
PSCE Special Programs
Memphis State University

Thomas W. Collins
Dept. of Anthropology
Memphis State University

Van Compton
Division of Arts & Sciences
Chattanooga State Technical
Community College

Franklin Conley
Volunteer State Community College

Virginia Conley
General College
Shelby State Community College

J. Charles Cooper
Director of Instructional Development
Jackson State Community College

Harry Cotham
Dept. of English
Memphis State University

Brenda C. Cox
Dept. of Finance and Real Estate
Memphis State University

Robert Cox
Dept. of Psychology
Shelby State Community College

J. F. Crabtree
Dept. of Mathematics Education
Memphis State University

Dixie Crase
Dept. of Home Economics
Memphis State University

Darrell Crase
Dept. of Health, Physical Education & Recreation
Memphis State University

Gladys H. Crates
Dept. of Mathematics
Chattanooga State Technical
Community College

Jane Cremer
Dept. of Business Technology
Shelby State Community College

Pat Crews
Cleveland State Community College

Terry T. Crow
Dept. of Physics
Mississippi State University

Susanne B. Darnell
University College
Memphis State University

Ruth Davis
Dept. of English
Shelby State Community College

R. Morris Day
Dept. of History
East Tennessee State University

Donald A. Dellow
Dept. of Foundations of Education
Memphis State University

Gary J. Doby
Dept. of English
Jackson State Community College

Ben F. Doddridge
Dept. of Marketing
Memphis State University

Barbara Dorsett
Center for Instructional Service
and Research
Memphis State University

John Douglass, Jr.
Division of Natural & Physical
Sciences & Math
Lane College

George L. Dowd
Dept. of Foundations of Eudcation
Memphis State University

Bob N. Duck
Assistant Dean
University of Tennessee, Martin

Jim Dunigan
Dept. of Geography
Austin Peay State University

Ed Ebbing
Center for Instructional Service
and Research
Memphis State University

Russell Edgerton
Executive Director
American Association for Higher
Education

Thomas Edwards
Coahoma Junior College
Clarksdale, MS

Jim Eison
Dept. of Psychology
Roane State Community College
Oak Ridge, TN

Joan C. Elliott
Dept. of German
Tennessee State University

Norman Ervin
Area Director Career & Coop.
Shelby State Community College

Michael D. Everett
Dept. of Economics
East Tennessee State University

Thomas Fagan
Coordinator of School Psychology
Program
Memphis State University

Charles B. Fancher
Associate Vice Chancellor for
Academic Affairs
State University and Community
College System of Tennessee

Floyd M. Ford
Dept. of Biology
Austin Peay State University

H. Ramsey Fowler
Dept. of English
Memphis State University

Evalyn Frick
Dept. of Mathematics
Shelby State Community College

Bee Jay Freeman
Shelby State Community College

Betty Frost
Jackson State Community College

Janice Fry
Director of Performance Funding
Volunteer State Community College

Ralph O. Fullerton
Dept. of Geography - Earth Sciences
Middle Tennessee State University

John N. Furniss
Dept. of English
Memphis State University

William P. Galle
Director of Graduate Studies
East Tennessee State University

Donna Gambill
J. W. Brister Library
Memphis State University

Art Garner
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

Juanita Gaston
Dept. of Geography
Tennessee State University

James Gholson
Dept. of Music
Memphis State University

Burl E. Gilliland
Dept. of Guidance & Personnel Services
Memphis State University

Polly Glover
Dept. of English
University of Tennessee, Martin

Mike Gootzeit
Dept. of Economics
Memphis State University

Anthony F. Grasha
Faculty Resources Center
University of Cincinnati

Bill Graves
Student Personnel & Counselor Education
Mississippi State University

Vera S. Griffin
Coahoma Junior College
Clarksdale, MS

James L. Grove, Jr.
Dept. of Biology
Jackson State Community College

Ouita Haltom
Dept. of English
Jackson State Community College

James E. Haney
Volunteer State Community College

Beverly Hardin
Dept. of Geography
Jackson State Community College

Robert A. Harrell
Dean of Instruction
Jackson State Community College

David Harris
Coahoma Junior College
Clarksdale, MS

Don Harrison
Division of Math and Science
Jackson State Community College

Joseph Harrison
Dept. of English
Jackson State Community College

A. Ford Haynes
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

Gary Heidinger
Dept. of Social Science
Roane State Community College

Ann Henry
Center for Enhancement of Teaching
Effectiveness
Murray State University
Murray, KY

Jeannette Heritage
Dept. of Psychology
Middle Tennessee State University

Jeanette Herrmann
Dept. of Human Services/Sociology
Volunteer State Community College

Richard E. Herrman
Dept. of History & Philosophy
Volunteer State Community College

Fannie Hewlett
Cleveland State Community College

Alice Hicks
Dept. of English
Jackson State Community College

Ralph E. Hillman
Dept. of Speech and Theatre
Middle Tennessee State University

John R. Hirschmann, Jr.
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

William H. Howick
Dept. of Foundations of Education
Memphis State University

Paul T. Hsu
Dept. of Sociology
Austin Peay State University

Ken S. Huang
Dept. of Art
Memphis State University

Modean Hudson
Coahoma Junior College
Clarksdale, MS

George Huys
Dept. of Educational Administration
and Supervision
Memphis State University

Charles Jansen
Dept. of Art
Middle Tennessee State University

Billy M. Jones, President
Memphis State University

Franklin B. Jones
Dept. of ACI
Tennessee State University

Zebedee R. Jones
Coahoma Junior College
Clarksdale, MS

Mina F. Johnson
Dept. of English & Speech
Shelby State Community College

Cinda Jordan
Cleveland State Community College

Tom Kernan
Shelby State Community College

Benna Kay Kime
Dept. of English
Jackson State Community College

Porter King
Dept. of Languages & Literature
Freed-Hardeman College

H. Graden Kirksey
University College
Memphis State University

Laurence Lackey
Dept. of Geology
Memphis State University

Quentin Lane
Cleveland State Community College

W. L. Lawter
Dept. of Aerospace Science
Middle Tennessee State University

Douglas C. Lemmon
Dept. of Music
Memphis State University

Robert A. Levy, Executive Assistant to Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Tennessee System

Barbara Lowe
Dept. of Nursing
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Michael Lupfer
Dept. of Psychology
Memphis State University

W. F. Mackara
Dept. of Economics
East Tennessee State University

E. Ruth Maddox
Director of Admissions
Lane College

S. C. Mahajan
Dept. of Biology
Lane College

Edward C. Mann
Vocational Technical Education
State Technical Institute,
Memphis

Robert Marchini
Dept. of Physics
Memphis State University

Irma G. Marks
Dept. of Chemistry
Memphis State University

T. E. Mason
Dept. of Engineering Technology
Memphis State University

Philip M. Mathis
Dept. of Biology
Middle Tennessee State University

John Matson
Dept. of Geography
Memphis State University

G. Douglas Mayo
Center for Instructional Service
and Research
Memphis State University

Powell D. McClellan
Dept. of Physical Education
Middle Tennessee State University

Lois C. McDougald
Dept. of History
Tennessee State University

Hugh McHenry
Dept. of Mathematical Sciences
Memphis State University

Perry McWilliams
Dept. of Sociology
Memphis State University

Inez Merrill
Bethel College
McKenzie, TN

Ronald A. Messier
Dept. of History
Middle Tennessee State University

Lillie R. Miller
Dept. of English
Shelby State Community College

Tyree Miller, Head
Dept. of English
Tennessee State University

Glenna Mingledorff
Dept. of Psychology
Volunteer State Community College

Orvil Moffitt
Dept. of Music
Motlow State Community College

Lewis E. Moore
Division of Social Science
Columbia State Community College

Martha M. Morris
Dept. of Art
Memphis State University

Theodore R. Mosch
Dept. of Political Science
University of Tennessee, Martin

Louis E. Mullen
Dept. of Accounting
East Tennessee State University

Bea Murray
Dept. of Psychology
Volunteer State Community College

Sandra Murrell
Dept. of Mathematics
Shelby State Community College

James K. Muskelley
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

B. I. Naddy
Division of Math & Science
Columbia State Community College

B. J. Naylor
Freed-Hardemen College
Henderson, TN

Betty Nelson
Dept. of English
Volunteer State Community College

Martha Newman
Cleveland State Community College

Bert Northern
College of Education
Memphis State University

Virginia M. Norton
Dept. of Anatomy & Physiology
Memphis State University

Sam O'Dell
Walters State Community College

Lewis B. O'Kelly
Dept. of Physics
Memphis State University

Paul Olsen
Dept. of Mathematics
Shelby State Community College

T. S. Osborne
Educational Support Program
Memphis State University

Merrill Parker
Dept. of Mathematics
Chattancoga State Technical
Community College

C. Edwin Pearson
Dept. of Distributive Education
Memphis State University

Harriett A. Peterson
Dept. of History
Tennessee State University

Clifford Phifer
Tennessee Technological University

Janet Pisaneschi, Assistant
Director for Academic Affairs
Tennessee Higher Education
Commission

James C. Pleasant
Dept. of Mathematics
East Tennessee State University

Thomas L. Porter
Dept. of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Memphis State University

Marian M. Posey
MSU Center for Enhancement of Teaching Effectiveness
Murray State University
Murray, KY

Earl L. Potter
Learning Media Division
Memphis State University

M. Mosley Powell
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

H. Leon Prather, Sr.
Dept. of History
Tennessee State University

Carol Purtle
Dept. of Art
Memphis State University

Thomas A. Rakes
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

Ernest A. Rakow
Dept. of Foundations of Education
Memphis State University

Yvonne Ralston
Center for the Study of Higher Education
Memphis State University

Richard R. Ranta, Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs
Memphis State University

Deborah Ray
J. W. Brister Library
Memphis State University

Ed Reid
Dept. of Social Sciences
Shelby State Community College

H. Lydall Rich
Dept. of Special Education and Rehabilitation
Memphis State University

Fred S. Rolater
Dept. of History
Middle Tennessee State University

Mike Rosborough
Dept. of Biology
Jackson State Community College

Steven M. Ross
Dept. of Foundations of Education
Memphis State University

Richard Rouch
Dept. of Economics
Volunteer State Community College

Robert M. Ruff
Dept. of History
Volunteer State Community College

Paul Sands
Dean of Instruction
Columbia State University

Bruce D. Saunders
Dept. of History
Shelby State Community College

Dorcas S. Saunders
General College & Development Studies
Shelby State Community College

Robert Saunders
College of Education
Memphis State University

Martha W. Scarbrough
Dept. of Mathematics
Motlow State Community College

John W. Schifani
Dept. of Special Education
and Rehabilitation
Memphis State University

Michael A. Schukert
Middle Tennessee State University

Janet Scott
Dept. of Guidance & Personnel Services
Memphis State University

Bob Session
Dept. of Sociology
East Tennessee State University

Mary Alice Shannon
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

Nancy Sharpe
Dept. of Art
Memphis State University

Lyall Sherred, Director
Instructional Media and Studios
Shelby State Community College

Bob S. Sibert
Dept. of Biology
Volunteer State Community College

Susan Silber
Dept. of Education
Shelby State Community College

Gloria Simpson
Dept. of General Education
Shelby State Community College

Bruce R. Smedley
Dept. of Music
Volunteer State Community College

Dennie L. Smith
Director of Learning Center
Memphis State University

Ronald Smith, Chairman
Division of Arts and Letters
Shelby State Community College

Alonzo T. Stephens
Dept. of History
Tennessee State University

William Summons
Dept. of Mathematics
Shelby State Community College

Phil Sutphin
Dept. of Educational Administration
and Supervision
Memphis State University

Fred W. Swift
College of Engineering
Memphis State University

Jerome Taylor
Cleveland State Community College

Rose Temple
Instructional Developer
Shelby State Community College

A. Robert Thoeny
Dept. of Political Science
Memphis State University

Michele B. Thomas
Dept. of Psychology
Tennessee State University

C. Lamar Thompson
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

Marion Thompson
Dept. of Special Education
and Rehabilitation
Memphis State University

Rod Thompson
Dept. of Economics
Motlow State Community College

Robert F. Todd
Dept. of Foundations of Education
Memphis State University

Harold L. Underwood
Dean of Instruction
Roane State Community College

Janice H. Van Dyke
Educational Services
State Technical Institute, Memphis

George Verrall
Asst. Academic Vice President
Mississippi State University

Connie Walker
Bethel College

Peggy A. Walton
Instructional Resource Specialist
UT Center for Health Sciences

F. G. Washington
Dept. of Health & Physical Education
Lane College

Byron J. Webb
Dept. of Geography
Austin Peay State University

Gary S. Webb
Dept. of Geography
Volunteer State Community College

John W. Welker
Dept. of Modern Language
Austin Peay State University

Al Westland
Dept. of Journalism
Memphis State University

Charles Wheeler
Cleveland State Community College

Jimmy Wiley
Coahoma Junior College
Clarksdale, MS

Willardeen S. Wiley
Dept. of English
Chattanooga State Technical
Community College

Luann Wilkerson
Center for Enhancement of Teaching
Effectiveness
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky

Allen Witkowski
Dept. of Reading
Chattanooga State Technical
Community College

Robert E. Wolverton
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Mississippi State University

Juanita G. Woods
Dept. of Mathematics
Chattanooga State Technical
Community College

Randall C. Wood
Dept. of Aerospace Science
Middle Tennessee State University

Rosestelle Woolner
Dept. of Curriculum & Instruction
Memphis State University

Kenneth E. Yancey
Dept. of Math-Physics
Lambuth College

Rebecca Yancey
Dept. of English
Jackson State Community College

APPENDIX D

PROGRAM

conference on

IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING

sponsored by

THE STATE UNIVERSITY AND

COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

OF TENNESSEE

MEMPHIS STATE UNIVERSITY

MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

APRIL 20-21, 1978

PROGRAM

CONFERENCE ON IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING

THURSDAY, APRIL 20

8:15 - 8:45 REGISTRATION. . . . . .Assembly Room*

8:45 - 9:15 OPENING REMARKS . . . . . .Assembly Room

BILLY M. JONES, President, Memphis State University

W. WRAY BUCHANAN, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, State University and Community College System of Tennessee

9:15 - 10:30 SYMPOSIUM - FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: SOME MAJOR ISSUES. . . . . .Assembly Room

MODERATOR: RICHARD R. RANTA, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs - Academic Programs, Memphis State University

PARTICIPANTS: T. EARLE BOWEN, JR., Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, University of Tennessee Center for the Health Sciences

FRANK CHARTON, Head, Department of Energy and Resource Management, Roane State Community College

CHARLES B. FANCHER, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, State University and Community College System of Tennessee

JANET PISANESCHI, Assistant Director for Academic Affairs, Tennessee Higher Education Commission

10:30 - 10:45 COFFEE BREAK . . . . . Assembly Room

10:45 - 11:45 INVITED ADDRESS: WHY WORRY ABOUT COLLEGE TEACHING?. . . . . Assembly Room

ARTHUR W. CHICKERING, Distinguished Professor of Higher Education, Memphis State University

CHAIRPERSON: ROBERT L. SAUNDERS, Dean, College of Education, Memphis State University

*All Meeting areas on the program are located in Richardson Towers, except Room 210, Ord Brister Library.

THURSDAY, APRIL 20

1:00 - 2:15 CONCURRENT SESSIONS

I. INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT IN THE UNIVERSITY

A. INSTRUCTIONAL PROJECTS . . . . . Room 6A

CHAIRPERSON: *LAURENCE E. LACKEY, Memphis State U.*

A1. USING INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION IN COLLEGE TEACHING

PARTICIPANTS: *DONALD A. DELLOW, Memphis State U.*

E. DEAN BUTLER, Memphis State U.

A2. A WRITING PROJECT AT MEMPHIS STATE

PARTICIPANTS: *H. RAMSEY FOWLER, Memphis State U.*

HARRY C. COTHAM, Memphis State U.

B. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS AND EVALUATION. . . . . Room 4A

CHAIRPERSON: *MICHELE B. THOMAS, Tennessee State U.*

B1. THE DOCTOR OF ARTS PROGRAM

PARTICIPANT: *FRED S. ROLATER, Middle Tennessee State U.*

B2. A DEPARTMENTAL SYSTEM FOR STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHING

PARTICIPANTS: *STEVEN M. ROSS, Memphis State U.*

ERNEST A. RAKOW, Memphis State U.

DONALD A. DELLOW, Memphis State U.

II. INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: EMPHASIS ON DEVELOPMENTAL EDUCATION . . . . . .Social Lounge

CHAIRPERSON: *CHARLES S. CLAXTON, Memphis State U.*

THURSDAY, APRIL 20

1:00 - 2:15 PARTICIPANTS: MARGARET S. BUTLER, *Motlow State C.C.*

VAN COMPTON, Chattanooga State Technical C.C.

BEA MURRAY, Volunteer State C.C.

BETTY B. NELSON, Volunteer State C.C.

DORCAS S. SAUNDERS, Shelby State C.C.

WILLARDEAN WILEY, Chattanooga State Technical C.C.

ALLEN WITKOWSKI, Chattanooga State Technical C.C.

2:30 - 3:30 CONCURRENT SESSIONS

I. CONDITIONS THAT ENHANCE LEARNING AND RETENTION . . . . . Room 4A

CHAIRPERSON: *CAROL PURTLE, Memphis State U.*

RESOURCE PERSON: *HARRIET A. PETERSON, Tennessee State U.*

CONTRIBUTOR: *JAMES EISON, Roane State C.C.*

II. IMPROVING YOUR LECTURE. . . . . Room 6A

CHAIRPERSON: *ALONZO T. STEPHENS, Tennessee State U.*

RESOURCE PERSON: *LOUIS E. MULLEN, East Tennessee State U.*

CONTRIBUTOR: *POWELL D. McCLELLAN, Middle Tennessee State U.*

III. EVALUATING AND IMPROVING INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS . . . . . Room 3A

CHAIRPERSON: *RALPH E. HILLMAN, Middle Tennessee State U.*

RESOURCE PERSON: *BURL E. GILLILAND, Memphis State U.*

CONTRIBUTORS: *MICHAEL D. EVERETT, East Tennessee State U.*

JANICE FRY, Volunteer State C.C.

THURSDAY, APRIL 20

2:30 - 3:30 IV. INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS. . . . . .Room 2A

CHAIRPERSON: MARTHA SCARBROUGH, Motlow State C.C.

RESOURCE PERSON: GLADYS CRATES, Chattanooga State Technical C.C.

CONTRIBUTOR: EVALYN H. FRICK, Shelby State C.C.

3:30 - 3:45 COFFEE BREAK. . . . . .Assembly Room

3:45 - 4:45 CONCURRENT SESSIONS

I. WHAT RESEARCH SAYS AND DOES NOT SAY ABOUT COLLEGE TEACHING. . . . . Room 4A

CHAIRPERSON: G. DOUGLAS MAYO, Memphis State U.

CONTRIBUTORS: MERRILL PARKER, Chattanooga State Technical C.C.

H. LEON PRATHER, Tennessee State U.

II. COMMON CORE AND INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTRUCTION: A NEW EMPHASIS. . . . . Room 6A

CHAIRPERSON: JOHN W. WELKER, Austin Peay State U.

RESOURCE PERSON: J. P. BLUMENFELD, Shelby State C.C.

CONTRIBUTOR: SUSANNE B. DARNELL, University College, Memphis State U.

III. INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION IN ART, ENGLISH, AND SCIENCE . . . . . Room 3A

CHAIRPERSON: YVONNE RALSTON, Memphis State U.

RESOURCE PERSON: NANCY SHARPE, Memphis State U.

CONTRIBUTORS: DEE ANN K. BROWDER, Chattanooga State Technical C.C.

RAY BURKETT, Shelby State C.C.

THURSDAY, APRIL 20

3:45 - 4:45 IV. EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING. . . . . Room 5A

CO-CONTRIBUTORS: *FRANK GARNER, Phillips County (Arkansas) C.C.*

NORM ERVIN, Shelby State C.C.

6:00 - 7:00 DINNER. . . . . .Assembly Room

7:00 - 8:00 INVITED ADDRESS - LEARNING STYLES: IMPLICATIONS FOR COLLEGE TEACHING. . . . .Social Lounge

ANTHONY F. GRASHA, Director, Faculty Resources Center, University of Cincinnati

CHAIRPERSON: *JERRY N. BOONE, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Memphis State University*

FRIDAY, APRIL 21

8:30 - 9:30 CONCURRENT SESSIONS

I. INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION IN BIOLOGY, CHEMISTRY, AND PHYSICS . . . . . .Room 4A

CHAIRPERSON: *B. I. NAIDU, Columbia State C.C.*

RESOURCE PERSON: *PHILLIP M. MATHIS, Middle Tennessee State U.*

CONTRIBUTORS: *ROBERT MARCHINI, Memphis State U.*

BOB SIBERT, Volunteer State C.C.

DON HARRISON, Jackson State C.C.

JAMES L. GROVE, JR., Jackson State C.C.

II. INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH. . . . . Room 3A

CHAIRPERSON: *JOHN N. FURNISS, Memphis State U.*

RESOURCE PERSON: *TYREE MILLER, Tennessee State U.*

FRIDAY, APRIL 21

8:30 - 9:30

CONTRIBUTORS: *LILLIE R. MILLER, Shelby State C.C.*

GARY J. DOBY, Jackson State C.C.

REBECCA YANCEY, Jackson State C.C.

III. INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION IN ANTHROPOLOGY, SOCIOLOGY, AND POLITICAL SCIENCE. .Room 6A

CHAIRPERSON: *A. ROBERT THOENY, Memphis State U.*

RESOURCE PERSON: *ROBERT PAUL SESSIONS, East Tennessee State U.*

CONTRIBUTORS: *LEWIS E. MOORE, JR., Columbia State C.C.*

C. P. BOYD, Jackson State C.C.

IV. INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION IN ECONOMICS. . . .Room 5A

CHAIRPERSON: *DAVID CISCEL, Memphis State U.*

RESOURCE PERSON: *ROD THOMPSON, Motlow State C.C.*

CONTRIBUTOR: *W. F. MACKARA, East Tennessee State U.*

V. TOUR OF A COMPREHENSIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT CENTER. . . . . .Room 210, Old Brister Library

EARL L. POTTER, Memphis State U.

9:45 - 10:45 CONCURRENT SESSIONS

I. INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION IN HISTORY. . . . . Room 4A

CHAIRPERSON: *RICHARD E. HERRMANN, Volunteer State C.C..*

RESOURCE PERSON: *JAMES E. HANEY, Tennessee State U.*

CONTRIBUTORS: *RONALD A. MESSIER, Middle Tennessee State U.*

R. MORRIS DAY, East Tennessee State U.

ROBERT M. RUFF, Volunteer State C.C.

FRIDAY, APRIL 21

9:45 - 10:45

II. INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION IN MATHEMATICS. . . . . Room 2A

CHAIRPERSON: JAMES C. PLEASANT, East Tennessee State U.

RESOURCE PERSON: JUANITA WOODS, Chattanooga State Technical C.C.

CONTRIBUTOR: KAREN A. BOWYER, Shelby State C.C.

III. INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION IN GEOGRAPHY. . . . . Room 3A

CHAIRPERSON: RALPH O. FULLERTON, Middle Tennessee State U.

RESOURCE PERSON: LOIS C. McDOUGALD, Tennessee State U.

CONTRIBUTORS: JUANITA GASTON, Tennessee State U.

BEVERLY HARDIN, Jackson State C.C.

IV. INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION IN ART AND MUSIC. . . . . Room 5A

CHAIRPERSON: BRUCE R. SMEDLEY, Volunteer State C.C.

RESOURCE PERSON: DOUGLAS C. LEMMON, Memphis State U.

CONTRIBUTORS: ORVIL MOFFITT, Motlow State C.C.

CHARLES JANSEN, Middle Tennessee State U.

PHIL VANDER WEG, Middle Tennessee State U.

V. INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTION IN PSYCHOLOGY. . . . . Room 6A

CHAIRPERSON: FRANKLIN CONLEY, Volunteer State C.C.

RESOURCE PERSON: MICHAEL LUPFER, Memphis State U.

CONTRIBUTORS: GLENNA MINGLEDORFF, Volunteer State C.C.

LARRY ADAMS, Volunteer State C.C.

ANNE BRIGHT, Jackson State C.C.

FRIDAY, APRIL 21

9:45 - 10:45 VI. TOUR OF A COMPREHENSIVE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT CENTER. . . . . .Room 210, Old Brister Library

EARL L. POTTER, Memphis State U.

10:45 - 11:00 COFFEE BREAK. . . . . .Assembly Room

11:00 - 12:00 INTEGRATIVE ADDRESS: THE CONFERENCE IN PERSPECTIVE . . . . . .Assembly Room

RUSSELL EDGERTON, Executive Director, American Association of Higher Education

CHAIRPERSON: *CHARLES B. FANCHER, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, State University and Community College System of Tennessee*

12:00 CONFERENCE CONCLUDED

APPENDIX E

ASSESSMENT OF THE CONFERENCE ON IMPROVING COLLEGE TEACHING

Directions. This is a "branching" assessment form. First, mark with an "X" one of the three alternatives to the basic question. Then depending upon which alternative you choose, complete the follow-on questions that pertain to that alternative.

BASIC QUESTION

How worthwhile was the conference?

___ 1. Very worthwhile. (*If you selected this alternative, please complete Branch No. 1*)

___ 2. Worthwhile. (*If you selected this alternative, please complete Branch No. 2*)

___ 3. Not worthwhile. (*If you selected this alternative, please complete Branch No. 3*)

FOLLOW-ON QUESTIONS

(Complete only the branch pertaining to your response to the Basic Question)

Branch No. 1

a. What were some of the more valuable sessions from your point of view?

b. Do you expect to take action on one or more points that were brought out during the conference?

c. Would you recommend that similar conferences be conducted for college teachers in other parts of the country?

Branch No. 2

a. Would you recommend that similar conferences be conducted for college teachers in other parts of the country?

b. If any topics were included in the conference that you feel should not have been, please state which ones they were.

c. What suggestions could you make for improvement of the conference?

Branch No. 3

a. What were the major weaknesses of the conference?

b. Were the limitations of the conference primarily a matter of weakness in concept, in execution of the concept - or both?

c. How could one make a conference of this kind worthwhile?